DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 868 SO 029 424

AUTHOR Andrews, Sharon Vincz
TITLE Foundations of Democracy in Public School: Building a Pedagogy of Pluralism. Final Performance Report.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1996-11-26
NOTE 42p.; Portions of this grant report were presented at the National Council of Teachers of English Midwinter Research Conference (Chicago, IL, February 1997) and at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges of Teacher Education (Phoenix, AZ, February 26-March 1, 1997).
CONTRACT ED-20141-96
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescent Literature; Childrens Literature; *Citizenship Education; *Civics; *College School Cooperation; Cultural Pluralism; Democracy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Language Arts; Partnerships in Education; Professional Development Schools; Public Education; *Public Schools; Social Studies; *Values Education

ABSTRACT

A 200-year journey has taken the United States from individualism to democratic community toward a global society. The struggles of this heritage are not evident unless political culture, literature of struggles, and diverse cultural contributions are presented as a whole. The focus of this project is the question: can public education secure and teach common values, such as respect for individual self-worth, cooperation and conflict resolution, justice and compassion and at the same time respect diversity? To appreciate the struggles of U.S. heritage, basic literature of democracy was integrated with democratic teaching methods. A collaborative network of 13 Professional Development Schools (PDS), partnered with professors from Indiana State University, created an institute to enrich the teaching of literature, history, and government for K-12 teachers. Three methods were used: (1) the study of the evolution of democracy by reading and discussing key texts and documents in the humanities; (2) the demonstration and experiencing of democratic teaching methods in the context of the institutes; and (3) the exploration of important texts in K-12 literature that deal with key values of democratic living. This report outlines the curriculum and teachers' responses to important events of the institute and gives a sense of the "lived through" democracy that evolved. (BT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 429 868

Final Performance Report

National Endowment for the Humanities

Grant #ED-20141-96

Foundations of Democracy in Public School: Building a Pedagogy of Pluralism

Sharon Vincz Andrews

SO 029 424

Director: Sharon Vincz Andrews, Ph.D.
Department of Elementary Education
Indiana State University
November 26, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Portions of this grant report were presented at the *National Council of Teachers of English* Mid-Winter Research Conference in Chicago, Febuary, 1997 and at *Association of American Colleges of Teacher Education* in Phoenix, February, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

TITLE: ***Foundations of Democracy in Public Schools: Building a Pedagogy of Pluralism***

Funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities
Grant # ED-20141-96

This grant report focuses on the driving question of this project: Can public education secure and teach common values--respect for individual self-worth, cooperation and conflict resolution, justice and compassion--and at the same time respect diversity? To the end of appreciating the struggles of our heritage, we set out to integrate the basic literature of democracy with democratic teaching methods, to expand our concept of our historically compelling goal: from the many, one.

We built on an in-place collaborative network of thirteen Professional Development Schools (PDS) connected to the University. Our original project was a partnership between professors of teachers education and humanities, master teachers K-12 from the PDS sites, and visiting scholars.

The aim of the 3-week summer institute was the enrichment of the teaching of literature, history, and government for K-12 teachers through: 1) study of the evolution of democracy by reading and discussing key texts and documents in the humanities, 2) the demonstration and experiencing of democratic teaching methods in the context of the institutes, 3) the exploration of important texts in K-12 literature which deal with key values of democratic living.

This report outlines the curriculum and teachers' verbatim responses to many important events of the institute and attempts to give a sense of the "lived through" democracy that evolved.

Descriptors: democratic education, school/university partnerships, collaboration.

Introduction

We began our grant work with the following focus question: Can public education secure and teach common values--respect for individual self-worth, cooperation and conflict resolution, justice and compassion--and at the same time respect diversity? We recognized that the 200-year American journey has taken us from individualism to democratic community toward a global society. We argued in our proposal that neither student or teacher can appreciate the struggles of our heritage when the political culture that enabled a democracy, the literature of its struggles, and the analysis of diverse cultural contributions are presented in isolation from each other. To the end of appreciating the struggles of our heritage, we set out to integrate the basic literature of democracy with democratic teaching methods, to expand our concept of our historically compelling goal: from the many, one.

We built on an in-place collaborative network of thirteen Professional Development Schools (PDS) connected to the University. Our original project was a partnership between professors of teachers education and humanities, master teachers K-12 from the PDS sites, and visiting scholars. We added two graduate students whom we felt would contribute greatly to the goals of the project, and two recent graduates of the Elementary Education program at ISU who came highly recommended by supervisors.

The aim of the 3-week summer institute was the enrichment of the teaching of literature, history, and government for K-12 teachers through: 1) study of the evolution of democracy by reading and discussing key texts and documents in the humanities, 2) the demonstration and experiencing of democratic teaching methods in the context of the institutes, 3) the exploration of important texts in K-12 literature which deal with key values of democratic living.

Assumptions of this project:

- The innovative curriculum development occurring in schools today grows out of social studies and literature, and it embraces the issues that the humanities address.
- The humanist traditions of literature, philosophy, and ethics have always raised and explored issues that classroom teachers also face--cultural differences, care of the planet and its human community.
- As schools increasingly assume the role of meeting place for discussion of controversial ideas, teachers must develop foundational knowledge and integrative teaching methods that respect individual and family beliefs while at the same time creating classroom environments that embrace tolerance and justice.

This project aimed to both engender and practice such processes in the context of rediscovering key texts and documents in the literature of democracy. Not only were we focusing on "teacher-as-humanist," but we were also encouraging "humanist-as-teacher," thinking through the pedagogical implications of teaching democratic texts, democratically.

The project embraced three components: 1) **Pedagogy Workshops** for Core Faculty to plan democratic teaching of the institutes; 2) **Summer Institutes** for K-12 teachers to study key texts in the foundations of democracy in History, Literature, Political Science, and Multicultural Studies; and 3) follow-up **Inquiry Seminars** to discuss implementing curriculum development at all levels.

As a result of the workshops, institutes, and seminars, faculty and participating teachers gained a better understanding of connections between the humanities content related to pluralism, the principles of democracy, and the pedagogy of pluralism, K-12 literature, and the development of classroom curriculum.

Evidence of Impact

Goal: Increased collegial collaboration between ISU faculty and personnel in PDS and non-PDS sites.

"Although I had high expectations of this institute, I would say that the biggest surprise was the close comraderie of the group under some pretty trying physical conditions (air conditioning went out in the conference center for several days!)"

Arts and Sciences Faculty Member (English)

"My surprise is the extent to which we have been able to think through democracy and work through the process--to discover what it takes for people to have their voices heard, what it takes to have people tolerate each other. This movement isn't nice and clean and tidy and polite. The willingness to struggle with this and with each other has been the most surprising thing to me."
Arts and Sciences Faculty Member (PolySci)

I was really comfortable with the core faculty by the end of the institute. The first couple of days, I watched the faculty and wondered, "Why aren't they sticking around? They are treating this like a regular class--they just leave. By the second week, they stayed and talked with us. I didn't like [faculty member X] at all in the beginning. But he assumed a responsibility at the end that he did not assume at the beginning. I really admired him for that. We talked among ourselves about how the core faculty changed. It was great. We [teachers] felt we has a part in that.

Middle School Teacher

As noted above, PDSs function as sites for teacher training and collaborative research. This network provided nine participants for this project (nine additional teachers from these sites worked on the Planning Committee for this proposal). Three of the thirteen schools are inner city sites--we were anxious to include these teachers in collaborative activities and to learn from them.

Our local high school teachers now do a great deal more to integrate history, government, and literature; the support and opportunity to think through the integration of the humanities in this institute encouraged further study and collaboration among these teachers. For example, Rich Schneirov, from our ISU History faculty and Sharon Andrews visited a "Culture Sharing" day at Turkey Run High School. Two of the teachers involved in the institute from this small, rural all-white high school developed a wonderful project with two institute teachers from the Terre Haute city high schools (PDS sites). The students became pen-pal and in some cases friends as they shared who they were and what their cultures were among students of different races and backgrounds. The day we visited, it was a field trip day in which a bus-load of students from the city schools visited the rural school.

In at least one elementary PDS site, we now have a critical mass of these teachers in our grant project who have returned to their schools and are modeling collaborative, integrated, democratic teaching. In spring of 1996, undergraduates in Andrews' reading/language arts class developed "Literacy Kits" using a number of titles from the children's literature list from the institute. These kits were given to all K-3 classroom in this school to foster parent involvement in their children's literacy and the teaching of values that support a democratic society.

In this same PDS site, ISU faculty and teachers have written grants collaboratively and have entered into what Andrews thinks of an "entrepreneurial" relationship. Because of the democratic and intense nature of the institute, she has seen the value of working with master teachers to help train her students. This semester, a teacher from the institute wrote a grant to fund a collaborative project among Andrews' students, her children, parents, and Andrews. Andrews' effectiveness as a college teacher has been expanded through her willingness to share the teaching of my students. The teacher's effectiveness as a teacher of kindergarten as been expanded as Andrews' students work with her children and parents. "Literacy Kits", developed by the ISU students on themes chosen by the classroom teacher, such as "Appreciation of difference--the elderly," "self-concept," "family and community" continue to extend the learning begun in the institute. Democracy and diversity are highlighted as college students make home visits, explore what it means to be a member of a family and a citizen of a community, and achieve more independence in their learning through choice and personal commitment.

The college students involved in the above-mentioned project have developed personal portfolios this semester based on the ten INTASC Principles, now receiving national attention as the basis for teacher education in the near future. The goals of the NEH Institute have supported us as we move toward improved teacher education. Two INTASC Principles in particular extend the work of the institute--"Teachers will understand the concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of their

disciplines" and "Teachers will work collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and community agencies."

Goal: Improved, democratic, integrated university teaching.

I came into this institute wanting to think more rigorously and in a sustained way about my own teaching, not to get a grab bag of ideas but to think seriously about my own pedagogy and philosophy of teaching so as to infuse everything I do with that philosophy. One of the things that I have learned is that I don't need to be limited by the goal of getting across the content, that the first goal is to engage the student in the material, that is it possible in all kinds of creative ways to have a discussion--begin with overheads, poems, a page or two from a larger document that they read in class.

Arts and Sciences Professor (History)

I have learned that good teaching requires time for reflection and for conversation.
Arts and Sciences Professor (Poly Sci)

I am surprised about how much I am now reflecting on my teaching. The liked the dialogues that the core faculty got into after our teaching sessions. Seeing all these different styles of teaching and then talking about them and discussion them--we're learning a lot about teaching.
Arts and Sciences Professor (English)

One thing that really surprised me and was inspiring--I have used that word with friends--I have never taken a class in the School of Education building that was worth much until now. I was amazed at how much I was hearing affirmation of the ideas of Habits of the Heart in the institute. This is what I haven't been able to put into words until now--that there are ways of dealing with students that are beyond presenting them with material to be learned. We tend to want to play everything safe--that's what you usually get in the course in the School of Education. The institute was a wonderful support for me to talk about things of the heart with core faculty and visiting scholars. The wonderful thing for me is that those core principles are everywhere. My friend is a Buddhist--I was talking to her about the institute. We are all looking for a piece of that spiritual life.

High School Teacher

At the University, increased democratic practice is being realized as a result of the institute. The institute had a close connection with the **Diversity and Democracy Project (D2)**, internally funded by ISU prior this project, which undertook to revise specific university courses, to increase active learning based on democratic principles, and to meet the needs of diverse learning styles and cultures. The institute provided a continuation of the democracy and diversity theme at the university, made it relevant in the public schools, and made needed connections between the humanities courses at ISU (populated largely by future and current education majors), and the teaching of humanities in the public schools. Here are some highlights of the impact of this NEH Institute on ISU faculty:

• The director of the grant, who teaches reading and language arts in the school of education, is now regularly using daily feedback sheets--a very effective tool use in the institute--to gauge the quality of her teaching and the students' questions, involvement, and ownership in the course. The effect has been a more democratic classroom environment. The director is teaching a "Values through Children's Literature" course which now includes a significant focus on our democratic heritage and the foundational documents of democracy as a basis for the values to be taught in public schools. The opportunity to develop ideas for using "democratic" texts for children in the Institute inspired a greater emphasis on books that are distinctly American in their values focus--initiative, achievement, choice, individuality, freedom with responsibility. Additionally, there has been increased collaboration with teachers in the field in grant-writing and in joint teaching efforts which have improved the quality of teaching for undergraduate and graduate students.

As a result of the grant work, she has redesigned her courses to foster more choice and decision-making for undergraduates and graduate students with the result that there is increased understanding of democratic teaching and processes and improved learning because of the new sense of ownership of the subject by the students. Course evaluations for one such course reflect students increased understanding of the importance of teaching democratic values in public schools.

• At least two of the five humanities professors involved in the Institute have reported increased use of more open-ended teaching strategies. They moved toward more student involvement and less lecturing. For example, a year after the completion of the 3-week institute, the humanities professor reported these goals as a result of his work in the institute:

1. continue developing and using democratic pedagogical techniques
2. increase my employment of stories and "storytelling" demonstrated by a visiting scholar in the institute.
3. recover and re-emphasize by usage of slides and prints of humanistic art and architecture to facilitate student involvement and discussion of key concepts.
4. continue to argue with [the English professor in the institute] about the existence or paucity of a "common culture" and common values in American history and education!

He reported additionally that he very intentionally employed techniques demonstrated by visiting scholars during the institute in his fall classes following the institute.

• A number of independent studies and "readings" courses have been offered and pursued by institute participants in English, History, and Humanities. A course on "Readings on Democracy" was offered by the humanities professor during first summer session in 1996.

<u>Goal</u>: Increase the network of communication between teachers and faculty at ISU and among teachers in PDS and non-PDS sites.

The IDEAnet (Indiana Department of Education Access Network) bulletin board and message system links educators in all school districts, via toll-free dial-up. Down-loadable data bases include school calendars, reports, and projects. We had hoped that it would provide an important link for consultation with each other, after the formal institute was completed. However, schools are very slow to install this technology, and even when the network is available, few teachers seen to find the time to use this resource. We have established a chat room which is used occasionally. This goal was only partially met. In April of 1996 and again in November of 1996, we encouraged faculty and teachers from the institute to use more fully the opportunities on the net.

<u>Goal</u>: Course humanities readings that provided a coherent intellectual foundation for the work of the institute--to examine our nation's democratic heritage through primary texts in the humanities in an interdisciplinary setting.

We were interested in building a coherent intellectual foundation on which to build toward these goals. As we analyzed the successes and challenges of the institute, we felt that the study of the struggle for a democratic society and the role of the individual in that society proposed in this grant helped to build a foundation for integrated curriculum. Several examples from teachers in their post-institute work show the integration and importance of course humanities readings.

• A high school teacher began her post-institute essay with a poem she had written about the visit of some Russian graduate students to our institute during the second week.

"What is democracy,?" said the Russians.
We were all smiling,
But also confused and scrambling
For a concrete definition
That didn't reveal itself, even then.
They did not expect it anyway.
In spite of this obstacle of definition,

We discovered how to inculcate quintessential democratic pedagogy.
We were enlightened and inspired.
We found a confident voice,
Learned how to listen
And how to trust.
We pondered positive and negative liberty,
Lincoln's wisdom and the patience of our mentors.
We did catch the breeze with a fish net
And sit on infinity.
I now have a sense of Franklin's challenge,
What it was and is,
To hold onto something that may only be sensed rather than defined--
Thunder, home, warm water.
Pass it on!

• Another teacher writes about a text used for "Essential Books" discussion in the history strand:

> *Out of This Furnace by Thomas Bell was a novel of immigrant labor in America. It inspired discussions of class and gender and its effect on democracy. Since our personal identity comes from such issues as class, gender, income, status, education, authority, and roots, these discussions "hit home."*

• A teacher who had just finished her degree and came highly recommended to the selection committee brought an innocence and freshness to the group. Her essay is perhaps typical of the response of elementary school teachers in the institute. It is focused on practical classroom applications and the joy of being introduced to new children's books.
• A third grade teachers gave a summary of her learning, touching on the impact of various presenters and the humanities readings they focused on. She also adds an extensive list of the thematic units she had developed as a result of this institute.
• Discussions that occurred around the readings during the history and political science core faculty sessions provided ideas for teachers to implement in their classrooms. The notion of the "town meeting," so important to both the early democratic movement in this country and the institute itself found meaningful focus beyond the institute in many teachers' classrooms. A fourth grade teacher from the institute wrote her "Reflections on a Town Meeting" as part of her post-institute assignment for course credit:

> *I wanted an authentic problem to arise that my fifth graders has a desire to deal with and solve. One day it happened. Due to high enrollment this year, the second through fifth grades share a small space for lunch recess. My fifth graders were frustrated by a number of matters and really needed to be heard. We put aside our schedule and talked. I told them that the only rule was that one person at a time was allowed to speak.*
>
> *Everyone eagerly participated. After about an hour I had listed everything on the board. I asked if they wanted to think about solutions and talk about them the next day. Yes! I explained that what we had just had was a "Town Meeting." "Town Meeting" was posted on the "Do not Forget" board and they left in an animated state!*
>
> *The next day the interest and excitement level remained high, so they decided to have the "Town Meeting" first thing. As they talked I listed solutions. It was interesting for me to see, that, given enough time, they could see which were workable solutions and which were not. They decided to invite the principal in to share with him the results of their town meeting and to*

ask him to consider implementing their ideas. They also wanted to ask him for alternative solutions for their ideas which he could not agree with.

Anticipation grew and the next day the principal joined our group. He listened as they explained:

- *how difficult it was to play football with second graders.*
- *how the adult supervisors always asked them to include everybody and did not seem to "hear" their side.*
- *how the football game took up too much of the playground space.*
- *how fifth grade girls need time and space alone together without being made to feel guilty about leaving the younger ones out.*
- *how equipment problems were frustrating.*

They asked for:

- *separate equipment boxes for their class that they could share but would have authority over and responsibility for*
- *once a week football games just for fourth ad fifth graders*
- *the playground supervisors to each take a separate parking lot for a play space once in a while.*
- *authority to say when the younger students were not playing appropriately during the games and to have them sit out.*
- *authority to tell younger students when they wanted to be alone*

The principal agreed to:

- *look into the equipment boxes idea*
- *separate the play areas occasionally*
- *a fourth/fifth-grade-only football game once a week*

He could not give them authority over the younger students but came up with the alternative solution of a designated area of the play space for fourth and fifth graders as "private space." They agreed not to abuse this privilege.

This town meeting took three days, but it was a wonderful experience with a satisfying outcome.

A number of the humanities readings had an impact on the group. The reading requirements were extremely heavy and we recognized almost from the first day that most participants could not read all the materials provided. People chose groups and reading materials that met their needs.

I really liked Habits of the Heart--some quotes really spoke to be about individuality. The Emerson piece on self-reliance--that was another piece that was meaningful to me. It gave me more trust in myself and fueled me for the risks I took in the institute and the risks I take at school--to sometimes fight the battles that aren't the popular ones.

Elementary School Teacher

I really loved the "Twelve Hughes" article and Martin Luther King's I have a Dream. But the Lincoln papers are the ones I have pulled to use in my classroom. Lincoln was very open and very focused--he had a goal in mind and he went for it--generals and the population didn't deter him--reading the book, Lincoln in Rich's group--it came together more than it ever had in any of my textbooks. He was a man driven by a goal and was not controlled by the events.

High School Teacher

I am so much more thoughtful about the Declaration of Independence since the

Institute. I have gone back and read it several times. I am trying to see through the current media and conventions to see if that is what we are doing--what we started out to do. I have really appreciated Rereading America--democracy is not flag waving and apple pie--it's wanting to help others and to participate in the process.

Elementary School Teacher

There are messages in the Gettysburg Address that I would not have picked out on my own. In conversations with others and in listening to other teachers, I saw much more.
Elementary School Teacher

Goal: Provide teachers with *materials/books* that help them prepare students for life in a just, democratic, compassionate, diverse society--to develop pedagogy that is responsive to the historical and present-day tensions between the mainstream "Unum" and the culturally diverse "Pluribus" (Carlos Cortez, 1990).

From the beginning of this work together, we felt that educators must be involved in the induction of our children into knowledge of our mutual history and of the informed moral consciousness which is the basis of any empowering education of a democratic citizenry. What makes public schools so important at this time in our nation's history is that schools, as much as families and places of worship, have become the dispensers of values. The use of children's literature to highlight democratic virtues and goals was very powerful and meaningful to the participants. A teacher wrote after the institute,

Out of all of the presentations, groups, or activities, that occurred during the three weeks, the K-2 literature group was the most beneficial to me. The literature group allowed me to make connections to the classroom that I may not have been able to do with the other material (humanities). We discussed values that were readily available within the stories, and ties to the curriculum.

Elementary School Teacher

A common sentiment among many of the participants was that *The Giver*, a children's book by Lois Lowry was a powerful statement about democracy/totalitarianism.

I loved The Giver--the whole society it presents, the longing for freedom that a democracy represents. I think that my Christian values were represented in this book. Love is so basic to our needs. When the main character, Jonas, realized that there was not a lot of love among the people, he takes the baby and leaves. He really cares for the child. You could see the love that the Giver has for the people--he's want to stay even though it's going to be messy. I walked away from this institute feeling that we in the United States are so blessed and I am grateful to all the people who have maintained democracy over the years.
Elementary School Teacher

The director of this grant, has subsequently published a book entitled: Teach Your Children Values: 95 Things Parents Can Do. It focuses on the "individual, family, community" and the values that support a democratic society. Many of the books and a few strategies from the Institute were included in this book.

Our African-American political science faculty member presented the group with a powerful lecture on "Myths about Race in America". This lecture and the novel, Sula, made connections for many participants between the "unum" and the "pluribus." A high school teacher wrote later in her

essay.

> *The last item I want to mention is the connection of Sula, an African-American woman born in the poor section of Medallion called "the bottom."What exactly did this have to do with democracy other than that these poor people are left out of the process? To my surprise, everyone's story in the novel carried equal weight to that of Sula. Understanding how each character related to every character tells the story of "the bottom." Each character represents universal community issues: mental health, death, disabled citizens, infidelity, class differences, and individuality. Every person has something that they bring to their community. E pluribus unum began to take on new meaning for me.*

Another high school teacher wrote on the issue of pluralism and her own growth:

> *I cannot look at or listen to people of color any more in the same way. I'm so much more aware now. I want my students to have a voice, to see color differently. We have a lot of kids from the country and they have strong beliefs about race. Some are second and third generation KKK. I would like to read Studs Terkel's interview with C.P. Ellis, a clan member who in the long run found himself uniting with a black person he had cursed in earlier days. That is a powerful article. I want to share as many multicultural books as possible this year. We have only one or two Blacks in each class at our school. It is hard to say that I don't want my students to see the color of a person, because I do, but I want their hearts to show more brightly than the color.*

Goal: **Provide teachers with *methods* that help them prepare students for life in a just, democratic, compassionate, diverse society, i.e., make a positive impact on curriculum in the public schools--to develop social processes that make democratic teaching possible.**

The developers of this grant believed that the question for citizens of the United States, and teachers in particular, has become, "Can public education secure and teach common values--respect for individual self-worth, cooperation and conflict resolution, justice and compassion--and at the same time respect diversity?"

One of our long range goals in this proposal was to develop content and pedagogy that are responsive to the historical and present-day tensions between the "one" and the "many." A long range goal for teachers was that they develop curricula which will enable such a pedagogy to function effectively. These methods were used in constructing the democratic conditions that John Dewey long ago described as essential to learning experiences (Experience and Education): self-reflection, active learning, cooperative group work, respect for others, voice and choice. The following sections indicate how we supported these methods in the institute. The italicized sections show some reflections/reports by teachers actively using the ideas with students.

Self reflection

Journals. One of the requirements of the institute was that teachers keep double entry journals to record ideas from core presentations and practical classroom applications of those ideas. The journals provided an interesting record for the director and co-directors as they attempted to tally data. The results of analysis of some of this data appears in two papers presented at national conferences in 1996/1997. (See Appendices J and K).

Daily Feedback sheets. These sheets provided both faculty and teachers with a means for discussing what was going well and what needed changing during the institute. After the institute ended each day, the core faculty and those participants who wanted to stay, pulled all the feedback sheets out of the anonymous suggestion box and began to focus of how the institute was meeting our needs and the goals of the work. This was an invaluable strategy for giving ownership and voice to all participants. Several of the faculty from the institute are now using variations of these feedback sheets in their regular classes.

Active learning

From a high school teacher about her colleague who was also in the institute:

> *He is so gung-ho about what he learned in the institute, it's hard to contain him. A couple of former [high school] students came to me and said, "What has happened to him? The chairs are in a circle in his room. There is a lot of discussion. What happened?"*
>
> *He has worn a tie everyday. I think he's feeling professional. He's re-established his faith in the profession, in that he could do something to make his teaching worthwhile. He is saying, "Okay! I'm ready to do the job!"*

Fishbowl. This strategy allows a small group to voluntarily sit in the center of the large group and give their opinions on an issue. As participants move out of the circle, others move in. This was a new experience for a number of the humanities faculty who typically rely on lectures and brief Q & A periods for dispensing information about a topic. A particularly powerful fishbowl occurred during the multicultural literature professor's core presentation. Two African-American participants (one faculty member, one high school teacher) role-played a powerful scene from Alice Walker's Everyday Use.

Jigsaw. Another strategy used by a core faculty presenter was jigsaw. Small groups each explored one facet of an assignment related to folktales and then regrouped to share, with a representative from each original group.

Quilts. Full wall quilts (large paper, post-its, and small colored sheets of paper) were used to explore ideas and feelings after some very emotional and meaningful passages from the humanities texts were read aloud. Silent viewing of the results made quite an impact on the group.

Literature strategies. The structure of the small group work focused on children's literature in the afternoon sessions was handled differently by each group. For example, in the K-2 group, the first day the group brainstormed the criteria they would like to focus on--values in the book, connections to democracy and the week's theme and core faculty presentation, related books, etc. Rather than the ISU faculty member conducting the sessions, the members decided to each conduct one session themselves on a book of their choice from the assigned texts.

Cooperative group work.

Much of the democratic group action was shared with the group in response to their "mini-revolution" occurring at the end of the first week. Many of the participants were unhappy with the schedule and perceived course requirements. The core faculty were willing to modify their schedule, ways of presenting material, and course requirements as long as the "givens" of the original grant proposal were maintained. After the participants requested a "town meeting" without the ISU faculty, their need for usable ideas for structuring large group discussion and consensus building became evident. Several half-day sessions were spent on developing workgroups based on interests, conducting productive meetings, and coming to consensus.

This was an uncomfortable time for almost all members of the group including the ISU faculty, but valuable notions of how and why democracy works, and the personal qualities and values needed to sustain democracy became evident to all. Some group members entered the institute with fairly developed ideas of democratic pedagogy and expected to see that demonstrated by core faculty who preferred mode of teaching was lecture. Others entered the institute with a mindset of great respect and deference toward the faculty and a willingness to "listen and learn" rather than question. These two group combined to create a few fireworks and ultimately gave all participants a true taste of democratic action.

Originally, we desired to help teachers become humanists in the highest sense of the word--not only inspired to rediscover our democratic tradition by the study of key texts but also informed about how to translate that inspiration into democratic pedagogy that respects diversity and nourishes respect. Most of us on the faculty side did not expect to have such an graphic example of how group

learned to operate democratically. We believed that more teachers know (and experience!) about the foundations of democracy and its implications for teaching, they more they can integrate those subject areas and ideas into their own curricula. We felt that teachers left the institute inspired by our historical study of democracy and challenged to create such an environment in their own classrooms.

One second grade teacher shared this reflection on "town meetings" in a post-institute essay on her application of ideas from the institute:

> *What I was most excited about this year in my own class was the classroom meetings we had at the end of each day. Sometimes we had a lot to discuss, sometimes not so much, but it really helped to build community. We solved problems together. The students knew that they really had some say in how situations were handled, and they looked forward to those opportunities. I think a more democratic approach has helped me have the absolute best class I have ever taught. I had one mother tell be her son felt safe at school. She did know know that my goal this year was to do that for every child. I had another mother tell me that her son does not get attached to people quickly, but for some reason, he has chosen me. I also had a father say, "I don't know what you have done to my son, but I appreciate it." Those comments in conjunction with the way my class was running democratically made me realize that this is the way I am comfortable teaching.*

A middle school teacher developed a packet of trust building/team building and conflict resolution activities to use with her students. She distributed this packet to all the faculty members in her school at the beginning of the year. The mission statement of her packet states:

> *Perhaps instead of exploiting and graphing our differences, we should first find that common ground among us. The common ground is that we are all one race--the human race. Within the human race, we find our individual identities. We are a people of wealth, poverty, handicaps, talents, strengths, weaknesses, shapes, sized, opinions, values, color, age, work ethics, socio-economics, fears, and dreams. A unique mixture of these defines us a families and as cultures.*
>
> *It is true that we have difficulty accepting that which we do not understand' whether it be within ourselves or in others. If we learn creative ways to resolve conflicts and build a community around us, maybe then we will reach the point of true unity.*

Her principal also gave her the task of sharing what she learned at the institute with the rest of her faculty and of working on enhancing appreciation of diversity throughout the curriculum at their school.

Another middle school teacher sums up the feelings of a number of participants when she says,

> *I have learned so much in this institute. There are so many changes I want to make in order to make my classroom more democratic. You would have to have been in my classroom the last few years to understand that the things I have been describing [classroom goals described in her paper] would require a great change in my teaching style. I feel so strongly that I have a major role to play in teaching democratic values to my students. I want my students to be able to function well in society. Students have to be given a chance to make decisions in their own lives at school or they will never even try to make a difference in society as adults--they have to think, challenge, and care.*

<u>Goal:</u> All participants would develop a greater understanding of American democracy and the conditions necessary for its development and maintenance--involvement, inspiration.

In answer to the question, "What did you learn about democracy?," in a near-end-of-institute

interview of faculty initiated by the teachers, faculty had the following to say:

I think I became more sensitive to the conditions that teachers ought to create to allow people who normally don't participate to take that risk. As a result of the institute, I'm more aware of strategies or ways to increase that vocal participation. I see that one mark of an educated person is not only someone who thinks a decent thought but is willing to say it and can say it with effectiveness. Now I don't really distinguish what I've learned about democracy from what I've learned about teaching.

Arts and Sciences Professor (English)

You can spout all the grand theories that you want but if you're not working at the level in which people have the chance to explore democracy on their own, you're never going to understand it. But you have to be there with a structure that keeps prodding and reminding and giving tools and trying experiments.

Education Professor

In a post-institute interview, teachers reported:

One reason I never thought of myself in democratic terms is that I'm not really big on the patriotic thing. The institute gave me a new perspective on the public life issue. I have never seen myself as a very public person beyond my church affiliation and "making the world a better place." I never saw that before in terms of institutions or groups, especially grass roots. Tat never had anything to do with me, so that gave a new view of the American experience and what it means to be patriotic. I have always been cynical about that. Now I am less a cynic about America.

High School Teacher

Personally and professionally, I really got a lot out of this institute--as a human being. I'm glad there were two other people from my school. We have met since the institute on our own with some other teachers from our high school. We had lunch for 2 and 1/2 hours! We couldn't stop talking to the other teachers about the institute--about ten of them!

I know how I am going to begin the school year with my kids. I am going to ask them: How are we going to be democratic? What is our agenda for the school year? I just got my "To Kill a Mockingbird" video. I'm going to use a number of articles from the institute, also.

iHigh School Teacher

It was like the institute was parallel to the American experience. We were living the American Experience in this institute, not listening to it.

Elementary School Teacher

Reflections on the Timeline

Mini-Institute/Orientation Day: Setting the Stage

The session began with a town meeting to make introductions and ask some orienting questions: What brought you here? What would you like to accomplish? Although most of our structure and materials were arranged prior to the institute, we wanted to help teachers set goals related to future curriculum development, journals, readings, and group work. We also wanted to assess skills, knowledge, attitudes toward the content. The afternoon of the orientation day was spent in

mini-institute activities. Each of four core faculty member from humanities described their input and did "Book Talks" on the texts they chose for their "essential book groups." Teachers chose (1st and 2nd choices) which "Essential Books" discussion group they would join each week based on their interests and their teaching areas. Teacher received a "Supplementary Materials Packet" of readings for each day and three K-12 novels that everyone was to read--one for each week of the institute. We walked through the calendar of events, and a core faculty member--an expert in electronic journals--introduced teachers to the use of electronic interactive journals for the institute and afterward. Teachers received all of their Primary and secondary texts, the "Supplementary Materials Packet," and their literature logs at the mini-institute. Core faculty members also received all supplementary materials, the three K-12 novels, and their literature journal.

A high school teacher wrote later of this orientation day:

> *I had decided to remain quiet and just let things happen. Many times in my childhood, high school career, and adult life authoritarian models were in abundance. Allowing things to just happen felt like broken-in fuzzy house slippers. Several university scholars made up the core faculty and they briefly introduced themselves. Each of us had to decide which strand would better suit our needs in our content area. I chose history for the first two weeks, and the multicultural strand for the last week. (NOTE: This was not a easy task. I peeked at the materials--they were all super appealing). I needed information that would enhance and give heart to my subject matter--I have technique, but not much heart. I was nervous. Exactly what would I accomplish in that three weeks? For the moment, I was happier than a hog with a new trough of slop: books galore, quality time with accomplished professors, the hope of three college credit hours, and $750--all soon to become a reality.*

The Summer Institute

We all hoped that the three-week institute would take us on an intellectual journey through the struggles of democracy in America. The planning committee chose three key historical themes for our journey: 1) Discovering the Democratic Self, 2) Constructing the Democratic Community, and 3) Sustaining the Democratic Life. Each of the themes was explored in a thoroughly interdisciplinary way, led by four core faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences at ISU. We were soon to realize that the struggles of American democracy are lived in the lives of all citizens every day. A teacher's eye view of the content of those three weeks can be found in a summary by a middle school teacher in.

Structure of the Summer Institute

The core was a series of "Interactive Presentations" (refined in the pedagogy workshops for core faculty in the Spring of 1996) given by the core faculty in the humanities. We struggled with many issues related to these presentations. Teachers sometimes were restless when they perceived "lecture" as the method of choice among the A&S faculty. The "mini-revolution," noted above, resulted in a modestly revised schedule based on teacher needs.

Three secondary strands supported the core presentations: **1) "Friday Synthesis Sessions," 2)"Essential Books Discussion Groups,"3) "Content-Specific Pedagogy."** The last event of the day on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, was the "Town Meeting" which teachers eventually facilitated for purposes of clarifying objectives, asking questions, and suggesting ideas for making the structure more viable for participants.

1. Friday Synthesis Sessions

On Friday mornings core faculty members of the School of Education, Terry O'Conner from Foundations and W'Dene Andrews from Curriculum and Instruction, will synthesize the key ideas, apply them to school settings, and help us explore democratic reform in schools. The original texts for the three Fridays were Democracy and Education by John Dewey, Schools that Work by George Wood (Chair of the Institute for Democratic Education), and The Night is Dark and I am Far from Home by Jonathan Kozol. All three books dealt with the individual and community values in school settings. However, as the institute approached, we found books that we felt better addressed the

purpose of the synthesis sessions. They helped us to link humanities texts and ideas shared during the previous week with the role of education in teaching citizens to reform existing structures and to redefine beliefs. One text which is substituted was The Power of their Ideas about a high school operated democratically. It came highly recommended by one of our spring faculty workshop leaders. The second was Teaching Kids to Care: Exploring Values through Literature and Democracy--in addition to dealing with children's literature it based on research into the values on democracy as reflected in children's textbooks over the past 200 years. The third substitution was The Quickening of America, a guidebook on democratic action.

2. Essential Books Discussion Groups

Participants met in small groups every day following the morning presentation by a core faculty member. At the Mini-Institute in March, teachers chose a major humanities text for each week to be paired with an education chapter or article. For example, the 8-10 teachers choosing the history text for Week #1 read Countryman's The American Revolution and Jefferson's "Educational Plan for Virginia". In additional to reading a major text each week, all participants read selected articles, chapters, and essays, such as Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream," prepared in a "Supplementary Materials Packet."

3. Content Specific Pedagogy

Late afternoons each day, we had planned to focus on pedagogy, but as indicated in comments throughout this document, the issues of pedagogy and its relationship to teaching about democracy became central and pervasive. We wanted to be guided not only by the need to offer thoughtful study of democracy's requirements of the individual, but also by the need to strengthen participants democratic and content-specific teaching skills. Visiting humanities scholars who were also experts in content specific pedagogy lead afternoon seminars. During the first week, the scholar on democratic pedagogy challenged to group to take charge of their learning and become more actively engaged. At a tense time during the beginning of the second week, the visiting scholar on conflict resolution was able to share mediation and group-building strategies.

During the week-three institute, participants began to identify areas of interest and ways of teaching democratic and social values and issues related to pluralism that they would like to explore in their classrooms during the following school year. These ideas were expanded and developed into concrete curriculum plans during the September follow-up "Inquiry Summit." The teachers from the institute met and shared their implementation of their learning during the institute. A full day of poster sessions and discussions raised the level of thinking and reestablished the ties formed during the institute. The seed were planted for an "Interfaith Reconciliation Conference" planned and developed by three of the high school teachers from the institute. These three teachers and two of the faculty members participated in this regional conference on diversity November 22, 1997.

Key Themes and Specific Content

Week #1: "Discovering the Democratic Self"

The first theme, "**Discovering the Democratic Self,**" was an exploration of the issue that individuals have greater rights than the community. Discussing solutions proposed by democratic thinkers challenged participants to re-examine fundamental themes regarding democracy's great experiment to create social settings organized to meet individual needs and to allow individuals the opportunity to grow humanely.

Each morning of the institute began with presentation by a core faculty member. On Monday "The Emergence of a Democratic Political Culture" waspresented by core faculty member, Richard Schneirov, Ph.D. in U.S. History. He discussed recent historical work which provides dramatic evidence that America's democratic principles were not simply intellectual creations of men like Thomas Jefferson, but were created by ordinary Americans as part of a revolutionary transformation of everyday life from 1765-1776. Through lecture, discussion, and video presentation we examined the ways in which religious awakenings, political and economic developments, and above all the rebellious actions of artisans and farmers against British authority established the basis of a democratic

political culture which, in turn, engendered the world's first modern republic.

On Tuesday, the topic "The Tension Between Individual Rights and Government Authority" was presented by Samory Rashid, Ph.D. in Political Science. The founders of American government devoted considerable attention to the task of balancing individual rights with the need for government authority, reflected in the concern over alienable and inalienable rights and consent of the governed. This session examined the inevitable tension between individual rights and government authority in a democracy and explore American responses to this tension over time.

One Wednesday morning, Keith Byerman, managing editor of African American Review and Ph. D. in Literature, focused on the examination of the self in relationship to community in a variety of cultures in order to help us understand the uniqueness of the American notion of individuality. The entire group read folk tales from African, African-American, Japanese, Senegalese, and Native American traditions which were discussed in relation to some better known American tales such as Paul Bunyan. Folk tales were interesting texts for this week because they are expressions of the general population and not a literate elite; they may be seen as expressing the most basic values of a culture.

On Thursday, humanities professor, Dr. Edward A. Warner conducted the final discussion for week one. His presentation was based on Robert Bellah's contention in Habits of the Heart (to be read by "Book Discussion Group 4") that "individualism lies at the very core of American culture" (p. 142). The aim in examining and defining American individualism was to aid the group in identifying criteria for a positive interpretation of individualism, such qualities as freedom, self-discipline, initiative, and creativity, as opposed to lack of discipline, egocentrism, narcissism, and anarchy. All participants, including core faculty, also read Newbery winner, The Giver by Lois Lowry, as their K-12 focus novel. It contains very sophisticated ideas about the individual in society and the responsibility of the individual--a very American book which cause the reader to reconsider the democratic freedoms we sometimes take for granted. *The Quickening of America* was also read by many group members during the first week of the institute. A high school teacher wrote later,

> *For the individual in the community, The Quickening of America gives hope to those who feel they have nothing to say or maybe that they have must never been heard. I plan to read parts of the book in my Economics and U.S. History classes, so that they can hear the outcomes of some of the voices that have pulled together for change in many communities. I would like to recommend this book to parents to instill the importance of parent/teacher/ community involvement. Transitioning students from school to community is a major part of my job.*

The impact of team building and conflict resolution activities during the first week of the institute was immeasurable. It is interesting that a group of highly educated professionals who work with large groups of students everyday would so desperately need and so highly value simple techniques for arriving at trust and meaningful problem-solving. By the end of the first week, the combined lack of air conditioning, tight schedule, too much lecture, and EXPECTANCY of democratic action led to a break-down in the happy group. Needs were not being met: What about that promised (and indeed, scheduled) reading and prep time? Why is there so much lecturing? Why aren't the teacher facilitating the town meetings? The teachers "requested" their own town meeting without professors or facilitators. As one teacher reported after the institute:

> *The town meeting at the end of the first week quickly became a Roman collesium full of lions, gladiators, and spectators. Tears, raised voices, noticeable smirks, grapevine conversations, rolling eyes, and threats to leave the institute was how we ended the first week of this much-anticipated institute. Over the weekend I read with better understanding of the necessity of having needs met. Bruised egos and hostility toward anyone with authority were the welcome wagon for the Week Two visiting scholar on conflict resolution! Her skills were going to be put to the test.*
>
> *Clearly, the men who wrote The Constitution must have believed deeply in and*

even loved the idea of a democratic society. Our expert on conflict resolution helped us to understand the tools we needed to build OUR democratic society.. The core faculty gave us the building supplies and we would be the construction workers. One particular strategy was a turning point for me: The In-Common Strategy in which each person wrote down three things that would contribute to the benefit of the whole group. Then each person found a partner and made an in-common list; each pair become a foursome with an in-common list and so forth. Every item did not make it to the final list, but everyone was satisfied that their voice was heard.

Another high school teacher had a slightly different view of the first week's crisis, much like a "reformed" British loyalist during the American Revolution:

It was frustrating for me to see the rebellious peers the first and second weeks of the institute. I could not imagine how they could conceive of changing the format of the institute! Would they do this in others seminars, classes, or learning situations? I went home angry some nights--I remember the first week on Friday--I walked home and cried as I walked because I needed this class (little did I know now much I would learn). I wanted to do everything right. There was time allotted during the afternoon for reading, but we weren't getting it because we were spending our time arguing at town meetings. Then it would be brought up again in literature groups. Would we ever get what we came for?

Looking back, I know now that the town meetings were really good learning experiences--I want to incorporate them into my classes. I want my students to see that not everyone will agree when a decision has to be made, that you don't all have to be present, that some of them will tire of listening, that there are different ways to look at every situation, that they will be the voices that will decide what the outcomes will be. I'm not sure that 50 years ago people would have wanted to go that route--there wasn't that much inquiring. Students came in ready to go to school. We're so much smarter now. When you don't know what's going on, you can't change things. Arguments every day, people wanting their voices heard--this is how we are in America, just like it was in the institute.

K-12 Literature Grade Level Groups--Week One

An hour each afternoon was devoted to discussion and correlation of children's literature with our focus themes discussed in the morning seminars. Teachers were asked to record connections between their morning texts and the K-12 books in their "Literature Journals" for discussion in the afternoon grade level groups. They recorded connections they were making between the historical struggle for personal freedom and self-expression with the constraints of living in a community which subscribes to societal freedom via a democratic system of government. The afternoon discussions centered around some comparison and study questions such as: Why are these books essentially American? How does a "democratic self" evolve? What are the connections between individuality, self-reliance, and the possibility of a democracy? Core faculty from the English Department and the School of Education led grade levels groups in discussion of the K-12 literature and will also keep journals.

During week one, "Discovering the Democratic Self," we explored the individual within society in K-12 literature. These books were categorized according to appropriate grade levels. High school teachers focused on Melville's Bartleby, the Scrivener which is included in some junior level high school texts. One possible theme was the failure of the individual to accept responsibility and the problems associated with the extremes of individualism. High school teachers also read from Thoreau's Walden Pond (the chapter on "Economy and Self-Reliance"), and parts of Emerson's On Self-Reliance. Julius Caesar was the most political of Shakespeare's famous history plays and its protagonist is a model for modern political conscience. From Brutus' speeches, the student of democracy can observe critical thinking about the individual's allegiance to a potentially tyrannous leader. De Crevecoeur's Letters from an American Farmer showed the character of American

individualists. Twain's Huck Finn showed the journey away from society and, through his encounters with other communities, the orphan boy finds a natural affinity with his fugitive partner, a black man.

One example for middle grades was Hatchet by Gary Paulsen, an award-winning book that provided an excellent text for the concept of self-reliance. Stranded beside a lake in the Northwest, a teenage boy must get along on his own. Middle grades teachers also read Newbery winner The Giver, by Lois Lowry, which focused on a young boy who was very much a part of community, but it is one in which individual choice is minimal (the antithesis of a democratic society). Issues of self-determination and conscience, "habits of the heart," and the inalienable rights are gone--pain is gone, but so is passion, love, reason, conscience and liberty.

Upper elementary teachers read The Great Gilly Hopkins by Katherine Paterson, about a young girl who struggles to develop her own brand of self-reliance and self-concept as she is shuffled between foster homes. Spinelli's Maniac McGee and Allan Arkin's The Lemming Condition play off against Emerson's On Self-Reliance.

Primary level teachers read S. Swope's The Araboolies of Liberty Street, Robert Kraus' Leo, the Late Bloomer,and Pinkwater's The Big Orange Splot--all focusing on self-concept and individuality. A variety of other books, such as de Paola's Legend of the Indian Paintbrush focus on the nurturing of and the ultimate strength of the individual.

These literature sessions were very powerful for the teachers--they came closest to providing links between the "large" ideas of the morning humanities sessions and the teacher's own resources for sharing those "large" ideas. The faculty leading those sessions, as well as the teachers, commented many times on the worthwhileness of these sessions. Here are some examples from near-end and post-institute interviews, conducted by teachers and faculty:

> *I have learned so much from the people I am with everyday in the literature groups. They are quite diverse in terms of their beliefs and their approaches to teaching. Trade books are definitely not used enough in the classroom.*
>
> *Elementary Education Professor*

> *Out of all the presentations, groups, or activities that occurred during the three weeks, the K-2 literature group was the most beneficial to me. This literature group allowed me to make connections to the classroom that I may not have been able to do with the other material. We discussed democratic values that were readily available within the stories, and ties to the curriculum. I found that many of the K-2 I would use to develop awareness of self in the democratic system I would also use to begin building the democratic community. For example, A More Perfect Union is a great story to read when the class is having a difficult time building the community. It's also a wonderful story to introduce The Constitution.*
>
> *Elementary Education Major (recent graduate)*

It was not possible to read every novel purchased for the upper grade literature group during the course of the institute. All books for the lower grades were read and analyzed.

Week #2: "Constructing the Democratic Community"

Week two focused on "**Constructing the Democratic Community**"--how do we organize individuals into communities? Having accepted the challenge of acknowledging individual worth (week one), the community was called upon to invent social structures that establish and preserve these social relationships. And this was exactly what happened. The group began to find itself AS A GROUP by the end of the first week. The struggle to have all voices heard and to find the means and mechanisms to do that was felt by every member of the group.

This week was quickly organized around a study of experiments in finding and institutionalizing the social structures and skills that preserved the rights of democratic individuals by placing the responsibilities of governance on them. We knew that we would be studying that idea but

we had know idea that it would be so realistically and powerfully played out in the institute.

We focused on the Constitution which outlines our government's structures, and we explored various attempts to institutionalize democratic communities. For example, Golding's Lord of the Flies examined questions about the fundamental nature of social forces. Madison's Federalist Papers discussed his views of how to control opposing interests. Jefferson's "Educational Plan" introduced his belief that democracy requires an educated, rational people. Dewey supported the Jeffersonian faith by linking Education and Democracy. The greatest challenge to the early American architects of the democratic state was the Civil War. Lincoln's "House Divided," his "Gettysburg Address," and his "Second Inaugural Address" drew out the principles at stake in preserving a democracy.

On Monday, we had planned that Samory Rashid (Political Science) would lead the whole group in discussion of the conditions necessary for constructing democratic societies. Since the mere adoption of democratic values provides no guarantee regarding actual government performance, those values require important and fundamental preconditions. It is so fascinating now to reflect on what we planned. The actual democratic tensions caused by differences in goals and needs among the group in the institute created the need for "living through" the preconditions for democracy that Samory was to talk about. However, instead of hearing about these conditions through a lecture or other activities planned by Samory, the need of the moment was for the group to be facilitated by Terry O'Connor (an experienced hand at processing groups democratically). Through a number of group strategies, they came to consensus about how the rest of the institute was to be conducted and scheduled. This "mini-revolution" among the participants served as an object lesson in our study of democracy. Terry said later,

> *Teachers need to keep their pulse on the dynamics of the class. When we (the faculty) tried to do this as a team, it didn't work--we all were expecting someone to be doing that and by Friday (before the "revolution") we began to hit a major snag. By Monday night of the second week when we went into this debriefing it was my goal to see if the core faculty was picking up on this. I was going to call it to their attention if they didn't. I think by Tuesday, we all recognized that we had address the problems and then I facilitated that process. We hadn't really done a good job of building in the groundwork for handling disputes in our little democracy. We had to do that. What surprised me was now locked in we got to the original schedule and how hard it was to dig our way out. It was like people didn't know or believe they had a right to question when their needs weren't being met.*

On Tuesday, with the more relaxed schedule in place, Rich Schneirov (History) led a discussion of "The Civil War and Reconstruction: Building A Democratic Community in the Modern Nation-State." The participants read Abraham Lincoln's Speeches that showed how he and the Republican Party reconciled the nation's need to guarantee basic human rights regardless of race with the need to create a new national government. McPherson's book discussed why slavery could not be resolved by the existing party system, how Lincoln slowly won over white Americans to the idea of emancipation, how he fused a sense of nationhood with "a new birth of freedom" and an updated spiritual mission for America, and why that vision failed for a time making necessary the post-WWII civil rights movement. "Book Discussion Group 2" read leading civil war historian James McPherson's Lincoln and the Second American Revolution.

On Wednesday, Keith Byerman (English) led a discussion of ways that communities are established and individuals are nurtured within them. "Book Discussion Group 3" will read Rereading America , edited by Gary Columbo--a collection of essays, fiction, and poetry from various cultural contexts in America. The entire group read "Everyday Use" by Alice Walker, a short story that asserts the value of a traditional community over an ideological one and a Studs Terkel interview, which brings out the idea of metaculturalism (Andrews, 1994)--core values transcending differences and reshaping the community. This session was a very powerful one in which Keith tried a "new" strategy called "fishbowl." Members of the group were invited to role-play characters from the

Walker story. Two African-American participants beautifully and movingly portrayed characters in the story.

On Thursday, Ed Warner (Humanities) continued a discussion of individualism in the context of the social contract. The "social realism" version of Bellah's individual selfhood provided the vehicle. It is anchored in a belief in "the inherent dignity and, indeed, sacredness of the human person." This version of selfhood is an emphasis on civic responsibility, corporate character, cultural heritages, and social connections. "Book Discussion Group 4" read Daniel Boorstin's The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson.

K-12 Literature Grade Level Literature Groups:

The K-12 literature for week two helped us to focus on the constructing of community and the challenges to community--literature that deals with issues of leadership, divided loyalties, or warring factions within communities. High school teachers read Golding's Lord of the Flies which deals with issues of leadership, representation, warring factions, and civil war. It also explored the desire of human beings to be civilized. Orwell's Animal Farm is a cautionary tale about the corruption of ideals and leadership. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Robert E. Lee's "Letter to His Son," and Chief Joseph's "I will Fight no More Forever" reiterated the challenges to constructing the democratic community.

Middle grade teachers read historical pieces about challenges to community in the Civil War era--Shelby Foote's Shiloh, Twain's The History of a Campaign that Failed and War Prayer, and Irene Hunt's Across Five Aprils. In contrast, House of Stairs is a challenging novel set in the future. Five teenagers in a house of stairs have been selected for a stimulus-response experiment. Community building was the subject of Gary Paulsen's The Monument about an artist who is solicited to build a monument to the war dead. He develops a series of sketches about the community that horrify the townspeople as they begin to see themselves.

Upper elementary teachers read Cox's Undying Glory about an African American regiment in the Civil War and Walsh's futuristic tale, The Green Book, about a family who must leave then-desolate earth to colonize another planet. Their choices define their new society.

Primary grade teachers read Cannon's Stellaluna, a beautifully illustrated story about a young bat who falls into a bird's next. She tries to learn to be like a bird and the birds learn about being a bat. Wonderfully affirming allegory about respect for differences and recognition of sameness.

Week #3: "Sustaining the Democratic Life"

In week three we focused on "**Sustaining the Democratic Life**" and pondered these questions: What inspires us? What principles, values, moral ideas sustain the democratic community? Week three acknowledged that democratic experiments in government are never complete; the individual's responsibility to govern democratically does not relieve the citizen from the responsibility to assure that these structures do, in fact, measure up to democratic ideals.

The Bill of Rights became a critical text because it provided the series of principles through which continual legal challenges are made in order to revise existing practice. Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird provide a classical look into the dilemma between existing society and moral imperatives.

On Monday, Samory Rashid (Political Science) led a discussion of civil disobedience as a necessary checks and balances system in sustaining democracies. On Tuesday, Rich Schneirov (History) led a discussion of "Class and Gender Issues in Twentieth Century American Politics" about the unregulated market system leading to a decade-long depression in the 1930's. Americans began to believe that big corporations could not be trusted to ensure the freedom and welfare of ordinary citizens. "Book Discussion Group 2" read: Thomas Bell, Out of this Furnace: A Novel of Immigrant Life which explains how, for a generation of working-class Americans, unionization was the core of the struggle for American citizenship. The entire group read from the "Supplementary Materials Packet" selections such as Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Inaugural Address, 1933", the text of "National Labor Relations Act", and Charles C. Hechscher's "Crisis and Opportunity for Labor."

On Wednesday, Keith Byerman discussed ways of sustaining community. "Book Discussion Group 3" will read Sula, by Tony Morrison which explored the nature of community and was

particularly useful for engaging the group in discussion of boundaries between community values and individual freedom. The entire group read three very different pieces that suggest what values ought to be central to the American experience: James Baldwin's essay, "Dark Days" considers the effects of racism on the upbringing and education of black children.

On Thursday, Ed Warner (Humanities)led discussion on sustaining democratic life by embodying the rights and responsibilities of American individualism in a radical existential manner. Love and hope must be aided by law and legislation. The actual democratic life is lived far more by aspiring and becoming than by having and being. "The best is yet to be....." in the "last hope of earth.

K-12 Literature Grade Level Focus

The K-12 Literature focus for week three was on sustaining democratic systems. The high school teachers read parts of Thoreau's Civil Disobedience and Harper Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird which presents a failures of the legal system.

Middle grade teachers will read Merrill's The Push Cart War about resistance of push cart vendors to modernization in a big city. K. Paterson's Lyddie, set in the mid 1800s, was about a poverty-stricken young woman who finds work in the textile mills. She feared joining the union at first, but in the end she stood up to the owner of the shop and protected herself and another girl.

Upper elementary teachers read Gary Paulsen's Nightjohn about resisting slavery laws. Naylor's Shiloh showed a boy's struggle between obedience to law and protection of an abused dog.

Primary grade teachers read a number of stories that treat the theme of sustaining the community through civil disobedience, work ethic, community service and charity. Selections included: Emberly's Drummer Hoff, Innocenti's Rose Blanche, Ringgold's Aunt Harriet's Underground Railroad in the Sky, Cannon's Stellaluna, Cherry's The River Ran Wild, Bunting's Smoky Night.

Extending the Learning--"The Inquiry Summits"

The inquiry summits provided a forum for designing and sharing the implementation of materials inspired by the institute. At a one-day "Inquiry Summit" in September, teachers and core faculty met to plan curriculum projects for the coming year. In November, teachers were invited to attend and present at a second "Inquiry Summit". Teachers brought photographs, charts, student work and other display items for a poster session on how they had implemented the ideas of the institute in their classrooms. Additionally, the continued and ongoing engagement of core faculty in the PDS sites was already in place. Two faculty members have developed or revised summer courses that reflect the content of the institute--"Teaching Values through Children's Literature" in elementary education and "Readings in Democracy" in the humanities department.

Pedagogy Workshops/Visiting Scholars

In support of this project, the School of Education provided funds for the Adams Professorship visiting scholars. The visiting scholars engaged the ISU core faculty in active learning of democratic pedgogy, including content-specific pedagogy in history, English, political science, and humanities. Core faculty partners from the School of Education and Arts and Sciences developed the content for teaching particular issues in literature, history, political science and religion--issues that relate to pluralism and democratic and social values prior to the pedagogy workshops. Visiting scholars for specific content and pedagogy met with the core faculty on the project in workshop settings for the development of the issues and the conduct of the summer seminars.

In March, 1996, Peter Frederick worked with core faculty on the interactive teaching on history.

In March, 1996, Nancy Letts taught Socratic Method for K-12 students and the college classroom. She has done a number of workshops on Socratic Method for school districts in Indiana and came highly recommended. She was recently featured in *Teaching K-12* for her work in teaching philosophic thinking to grade school children. She contributed significantly to our understanding of kind of thinking skills necessary for sustaining a democratic society.

In April, 1996, Jerry Ward conducted a two-day workshop on the teaching of poetry and

literature.

In May, 1996, Fred Schroeder joined us for an all day pedagogy workshop on interactive, democratic teaching methods specific to the study of history and government.

All of the above-mentioned scholars returned for week during the summer institutes to provide feedback to ISU core faculty on their conduct of the institute and to conduct pedagogy workshops in their areas for the institute participants. Joining these scholars were three additional scholars: Karen Decker, a leader in conflict resolution strategies, Cynthia McDermott, a foundations professor from California who specializes in democratic pedagogy, and Ms. Donna Martin, 5th/6th grade teacher from a culturally diverse Houston school and ISU graduate, who shared her work on democratic teaching, based on a grant she received from the Houston School district.

There were no changes in key personnel during the course of the grant work other than the substituion of Karen Decker for Sheron Daily and Lisa Skow, who left the University and could not join us for the institute. Project goals were achieved. The work of this project continues in the lives and classrooms of the teachers/faculty who participated. The evaluator's comments are found in **Appendix A.**

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX Q

EVALUATION

Is "Democratic Education" an Oxymoron?--An Evaluation of the NEH/ISU Summer Institute for Teachers

The following instructions for the evaluator were received via e-mail by way of Sharon Andrews from Janet Ray Edwards:

For your evaluator: yes, please assess the project's collegiality. In addition, comment on the intellectual quality of the project, including scholars' presentations* and connections established by participants between the intellectual content and their own classrooms. We'd appreciate a candid assessment of any problems encountered--and how they were dealt with--as well as of the strengths of the project. Base your evaluation on your understanding of the project's goals as identified in the proposal narrative. And feel free to comment on any matter that you judge significant.

For scholars' presentations, consider both the intellectual quality per se and the scholar's ability to pitch the level of his/her talk so as to intersect with the intellectual backgrounds of the participants, while "stretching" them a bit.

Janet Ray Edwards
Program Officer
Division of Research and Education
National Endowment for the Humanities

Approval

Dr. Sharon Andrews of Indiana State University, with her experiment in "democratic education," has staged, perhaps, the best single teacher-education workshop/faculty-development seminar that I have witnessed in my 25 years of professional Education. Its outcomes are wholly in accord with the intentions of the program, though many of the outcomes had not been foreseen and were not planned.

I do not mean to say that everything about the "ISU Summer Institute for Teachers (June 10-29, 1996)" achieved its intended and stated purpose, was good instruction, or led to maximum programmed and predicted learning; quite the contrary, for some things about "the Institute" (as everyone came to refer to the event) fomented rebellion and revolution, caused the presenters and the participants alike to reconsider their approaches to teaching and learning, and caused some people to go away in dismay.

Precisely for this reason, however, I am willing to give Sharon an A+ for "process" and "outcome." She set out to foster the exploration of teaching and learning as a democratic exercise, and that exploration is exactly what took place: Like democracy itself, the experimental process was paramount, and it generated progress not only towards formal knowledge but also towards experiential understanding of school teaching as a democratic enterprise.

How this evaluation was prepared

Because of Sharon's and my previous author/editor relationship, I was in a good position to be useful both in terms of formative as well as of summative assessment. Sharon and I discussed her proposal before she submitted it to the Endowment; shortly before the Institute began, we talked again about her expectations; and I was a contributor to the questionnaire (attached) used on the first day of the Institute to elicit from the participants their prior attitudes regarding the nature of democracy, democratic teaching and learning, and its opposite.

Then, I paid day-long visits to the Institute, one day each of the three weeks (the first Monday; Thursday of the second week; and Friday, the last day of the Institute). During these visits, I spoke at length with as many people as there was time and opportunity to speak with, and

with representative types: Sharon, core faculty members, visiting scholars, and participants. I spoke with some people only once; with others, I discoursed at length on all three occasions. That way, I took both one-time snap-shot views of the Institute as well as hearing "longitudinal" interpretations of the event from people with whom I had an "on-going relationship."

During my visits, I floated from session to session, working group to working group; I ate with the people when they ate; I lurked in corners with individuals in agony and heard their complaints; I stayed late to join debriefing sessions. Because these were all school teachers, there were tons of handouts; I collected as many parti-colored sheets of genius paper as I could carry.

During the course of the Institute, Sharon and I conversed on the telephone a few times, discussing some of the critical issues that had arisen. After the close of the Institute, Sharon and I debriefed in summary fashion. I submitted this document to Sharon with the understanding that she was welcome to correct any misrepresentations of fact. I have noted the points wherein Sharon and I disagree over interpretation of events and meaning.

Narrative of the Institute: The rocky course of democracy

Week One

On the first day of the Institute, Sharon was having appropriate stomach butterflies, and everyone else's spirits seemed equally high. Expectations were high, too, especially in view of the obviously enormous work load about to be imposed and accepted. A tight schedule had been worked out by Sharon and her college of experts and core faculty; it was apparent from the outset that the participants were going to be bombarded with a lot of high quality reading, thinking, and interacting.

Already on the first day--and this is a point that would ordinarily not be mentioned, except that it became a material issue later on--the air conditioning on the 11th floor of the Ed. Blgd. was too cold. Moreover, lunch was only adequate.

At the end of the first day, I was concerned that the Institute would never get around to the real issues of democracy. I was already half persuaded that "democratic education" is an oxymoron, and especially in view of the autocratic ways that teachers are taught, how can we expect them to do otherwise than to perpetuate the intellectual autocracy in which they have been brought up. Analogy: People who are abused as children grow up to be abusers of children; people who are taught by autocratic teachers grow up to teach autocratically. We do unto others as we have been done unto. I was raising the question: "What would happen to this Institute if the process really were democratic in the sense that the revolutionary American government is politically democratic?"

Sharon, fretting about her Institute, was wondering if mostly "control freaks" go into education--"I'm uncomfortable not being in control." Sharon had already sensed that control of the Institute would, in some way, pass out of her hands.

Week Two

By the time I returned a week and one-half later, an insurrection had taken place that was along the way towards becoming a rebellion. Ups and downs of air conditioning--from too cold to none at all--had aggravated the situation, and the real issues fed on this discomfort. Sharon had been dethroned as "queen," and a group of (I think) four representative participants now sat in on debriefings with core faculty and visiting scholars. A "Town Meeting" feature had been added by popular demand, a first-thing-in-the-morning group session at which matters of common interest were discussed (too much discussion for some; not enough discussion for others) and voted on. The tight schedule had been considerably relaxed and reorganized. Pre-planned sessions had been scrapped in favor of smaller, voluntary working groups called "interest groups." One core faculty person's instructional style had been (mis)interpreted as heavy-handed, and the reaction of the participants to this bump in the road had been the defining moment: From that point on, revolution was in the wind.

By the end of the second week Sharon confessed that the Institute thus far had made her less of a democrat. Rehearsing the course of the insurrection that became a rebellion that became a revolution, she quoted one participant who said: "We would have found some reason over which

to find our voice and revolt." It was almost as if "democracy" were a virus which, once a group is infected with it, will erupt in democratic effects, whether they are worthy or petty, matters of high value or merely affirmations of the rabble "doing its own thing." As a Black gentleman from Ghana commented: "I have completely changed my mind about what democracy is. It's not just politics and voting and getting elected; it's asking the question: `Is it right for us?'" I think he got the lived-out message of the Institute.

Surveying the rubble of the post-revolutionary situation, Sharon commented on the "inefficiency" of "consensus"; observed that "the governance group" had given way to representative democracy, with a 2/3 majority rule required for approval by the Town Meeting, and the emergence of an "alternative group" that theoretically represented the entire body politic at faculty meetings. Sharon may not have noticed at the time that the "representatives of the people" happened also to have been among Queen Sharon's staunchest supporters. In this instance, democratic revolution was evolving towards a post-revolutionary aristocracy of the best, the brightest, and the most meritocracious. Had the Institute lasted another three weeks, it would have been interesting to see whether the guillotine would have fallen on the necks of these half-way revolutionaries, as they did on Robespierre and M. Guillotine himself!

By the end of the bureaucracy, the entire process is set up in a non-democratic fashion. Sharon said that her biggest "screw-up" had been in imposing a temporary schedule that was uncomfortable, and that, in part, had been the cause of the insurrection. Her "suffering" as a result of the rebellion, therefore, was legitimate suffering as the sacrificial lamb in the small-group process: Someone has to stick their neck out in order to get things going, and then be willing for the group to react and to change direction. A DOT activity, finding your family-grouping-team-building- type activity that Karen (a visiting scholar on conflict resolution) had done, and an interactive role-playing strategy called "Fishbowl" that Keith Byerman had done set the stage for real solidarity among the group members. The Institute was cooking.

Sharon was processing the effects of the democratic "take-over" of the institute and the implications for her herself. She acknowledged her previous role as "oppressor"--how else could it work but that someone gets a grant from the Endowment, makes a plan, organizes the event, and then lets the chips fall where they may? As a result of a central government bureaucracy, the entire process is set up in a non-democratic fashion. Sharon said that her biggest "screw-up" had been in imposing a temporary schedule that was uncomfortable, and that, in part, had been the cause of the insurrection. Her "suffering" as a result of the rebellion, therefore, was legitimate suffering as the sacrificial lamb in the small-group process: Someone has to stick their neck out in order to get things going, and then be willing for the group to react and to change direction. Sharon had done her job well and right to this point.

Sharon honestly and healthily registered her momentary feelings in private, verbalizing her sense of the experience:

> *I work on the basis of personal relationships. People didn't let me know that I had screwed up. I don't want to be "processed" by the group. I don't like conflict. "Process" as some of these people want to use it is a way to deal with conflict in a non-personal way. I want a society that is both just and compassionate. I am sensitive to people's feelings, and there has been some rudeness and lack of civility. [Marie Antoinette, I thought to myself, would have agreed!]*
>
> *But these experiences were real-world; the participants made their needs known. Maybe the expectations of about one-quarter of the group are higher than the Institute is capable of delivering.*

Response from Sharon: *I felt at the time that I had totally misread the group. I didn't realize how important it was to them to carry on with their town meeting that morning and really resolve some of the problems that were surfacing. They needed to find their "group voice." My unilateral temporary rescheduling (because of the arrival of a new visiting scholar) served to really exacerbate the disconnected, lack-of-control feelings of the group. I felt that our resident Foxfire expert--a core faculty member--blamed me for not having my finger on the pulse of the class. I really had to*

let it go and let the group find its own way. There were many emerging leaders among both the faculty and the teachers, but it was hard to realize that I had failed to recognize the needs of the group and that when I did, someone else needed to pick up the ball--not me.

I recite some of Sharon's verbatims here neither to remind her nor to embarrass her, but to give evidence of the integrity of the process through which she and the others were going. She might agree or disagree now with what she said then, but her honest comments then are instructive to us now.

At a core-faculty meeting, there was some grousing: "This is not right." "What are the expectations of the Endowment?" "Foxfire is not getting to do its thing." But, on the other hand, people reasoned: "There's too much lecturing by the core faculty."

Perhaps the genial humanist on the core faculty, had the clearest vision of what was going on for others--though not for himself. Of himself, he said: "I want and give democratic respect." (In this atmosphere, one MUST say that one is a democrat, but Ed was one of the best lecturers in the lot and, in commensurate degree, one of the least democratic teachers.) Of Sharon, however, and of the democratic effects of the Institute, Ed remarked astutely:

> *Sharon was hurt, but her optimism took it on the chin; she demonstrated realistic maturity; integration will continue in all of us. It's affecting the presenters as much as it is the participants. We are all changing--we have to change--what we are saying and doing.*

By the end of the second week, I was convinced that the facilitators were not communicating with one another enough about the process through which they were all passing. People's ideas and feelings were on the line; Sharon was battered and bruised, but no one ever addressed that issue in a responsible way. Not that Sharon needed hand-holding--she's a big girl and can take care of herself--but in terms of the instructional usefulness of helping other school teachers find out that, if they foment democracy in their classrooms and schools, they, too, someday shall be battered and bruised by the process, and then helping them figure out what to do about that. The Institute was mired in factional conflict with a need to resolve certain issues.

One humorous fellow classified the factions as follows:

•The Edders--Educationist types (especially the "process people" among the core faculty and guest experts) who are "more controlling"
•The PhDers (pronounced "phudders")--the content and humanist types, who are "more free-wheeling"
•The Elems--who are more controlling because of the nature of whom they teach, little kids who have to be controlled
•The JrHi's--who are moderately controlling
•The Hi-Schoolers--who are the least controlling among the participant-teachers

An eyes-open, heads-up attempt to deal with this would have been developmentally educational for the participants, teachers who themselves will suffer revolutionary fall-out when they try to teach democratically. I wanted Sharon, the core faculty, and the guest experts to verbalize and model these realities, and then to engage the whole Institute in "processing" these effects. I was never satisfied that this matter was sufficiently dealt with.

Response from Sharon: *Our conflict resolution visiting scholar did the best she could to get us back to an operating group. She did wonderful job under the circumstances. Given all that was on my plate, I could not mentally or emotionally pursue additional conflict and resolution. We needed to get on with the program. Here Warren would say: But that IS the program. Maybe so, but scholar continued to arrive, participants has needs beyond a continued rehashing or even resolution of the conflict. The town meetings and work early the second week provided a release and a*

working model of democratic action that all could live with.

Week Three

By the end of the third week, insurrection had passed through rebellion into full-fledged revolution, and by the end of the Institute, we were in a post-revolutionary situation: Sharon, no longer queen, had also, however, not been "decapitated." In fact, she was now accorded full regard as guiding spirit, and in all important matters, she was at least consulted and usually deferred to at least informally. (Charles I was beheaded, and after the Cromwellian interregnum, Charles II was crowned. The king was dead; long live the king!)

Post-revolutionary action had carried the Institute out and away from the ISU Ed. Blgd. in a protest over food control: The University's Food Service had complained that the Institute was providing its own coffee and donuts, and demanded that its "closed-shop" control over food delivery and service be accepted by/imposed upon the Institute. The Institute thereupon further rebelled, seceded from the 11th floor, and moved all further meetings off campus to a middle school 20 minutes south of Terre Haute. Considerable rhetoric was expended by the group in congratulating itself on this change of venue, greater comfort, better food, and appropriateness: School teachers said that they felt more at home in a middle-school cafeteria than they did on the 11th floor of the ISU Ed. Blgd.

The schedule of activities had undergone further relaxation, and now a reduced roster of the pre-planned sessions were being held, having been replaced with small "interest group" activities and project groups, each of which had devised its own assignment, consistent with the theme of the Institute and informed by the formal presentations of the core faculty and visiting scholars. Core faculty members and visiting scholars were now expected, in addition to making whatever presentations they had been hired to make to take part in the overall process as equal citizens and provide assistance at the invitation of the several groups.

On the last day, the participants, not the organizers and faculty, were in full control of the Institute and in possession of the microphone; participants, not the organizers and faculty, presided over the day-long series of closing events, and the core faculty were "invited" bottom-up by the participants to offer their opinions, rather than the organizers and faculty addressing the participants as "students" in the top-down classic mode. The revolution was complete: Thrones and dominations had been cast down; the people had arisen, had found their common voice, had spoken, and had taken charge of the Institute, making it and its outcomes their own, for good or ill.

The agenda of the final day included considerable self-congratulation on the part of the "elected representatives" who had come to typify the take-over of the Institute by the participant. Comments were made about the change of food, venue, A/C, and someone, alluding to the Boston Tea Party, got a cheer by saying that the Institute had "thrown our turkey sandwiches into the Wabash." Someone else said that "we have all been trying to find democracy," and that now, as individuals, we can make a difference-- "it lessens my cynicism."

Two women engaged in a bit of democratic karaoke, parodies of popular songs ("Democratic, and it feels so good"), that gave symbolic voice to what the participants thought they had accomplished.

A Black woman gave honor to the dethroned Queen Sharon (who now comfortably exercised her power so quietly that she deserves a place in the Taoist Rulers Hall of Fame: "The ruler who rules best is the ruler whose rule is not felt as rule by the people." (Tao Te Ching) Nancy Letts, visiting scholar, commented that "Sharon has grown the most because she has suffered the most." Nancy went on to opine that the Institute was now ready for its next three weeks. (We often have the feeling, do we not, that about the time a course is over, it's ready to begin. This was the decided feeling of the Institute on its last day.)

There was some evidence that the teacher-participants and some of the core faculty were processing the implications for teaching theory and practice of the democratic events of the past three weeks. A long, good list of implications had been drawn up and was inscribed on butcher paper, waiting for general discussion. This took place in small groups with each participant declaring and recording goals for their own classroom during the coming year. But there was too

much karaoke, too much speech-making, too much wind-down quite to get back to anything as heavy as reflecting on the implications. (Democracy is not the tidiest or most efficient for of government--no one has ever argued that it is.) Among the issues that wanted discussion were such questions as these:

•How do we define "respect" in the democratic environment?
•How do we check the accuracy of someone's interpersonal response?
•What actions require permission from someone else before they can be taken? •What are the relativities of permission and power?
•What does "equality" (conceived originally as the political franchise of equality at the ballot box) mean when applied in other contexts: People are not really born equal, when it comes to intelligence and other personal gifts, yet we have the feeling that we must view others as equal in value.
• With Paolo Freire, when ought students to take part in defining their own learning, and how far ought we to go in "allowing" them to do so?

I was not satisfied--and some of the visiting scholars expressed similar concerns to me--that the core-faculty who had been present throughout the process had inadequately assisted the participants in thinking through the events and concerns of the Institute in terms of future management of instruction and their own future performance in the classroom. Nancy Letts, a distinguished expert on Socratic dialogue as a pedagogical method, was quite incisive in her negative judgment on this point: "The core faculty has failed to behave towards one another in a democratic fashion, so they have failed to lead the participants into democratic education".

This failure to process the fallout of the Institute, which I consider to have been its most interest and challenging and democratically instructive feature, was a failure in educational leadership on the part of people who are paid to be educational leaders and innovators. Because it hadn't been on the menu, however, it seemed that they could not quite overcome their staid university habits enough to roll with the punches. The core-faculty people were too much immersed in the process itself to be able to be objective about it; the visiting scholars felt themselves to be too much outsiders to take firm hold of the helm and steer the ship. The director was no longer in a position to dictate terms, and in no frame of mind to take on the whole crowd in an all-court press over issues that would have required another three weeks to address.

The project's goals as identified in the proposal narrative: The project's collegiality.

a. Approval of self-evident collegiality

Without question, Sharon established and, together with her academic colleagues, maintained a fine style of university collegiality from the first pre-Institute planning sessions and right through the three-week duration and beyond into post-Institute debriefings that will last unto one-day return engagements yet to be held in September and October. During the Institute, the give-and-take among the core faculty and the visiting scholars, allowing for individual differences of style, seemed to bear of evidence of a normal state of collegial affairs.

b. Collegiality on the surface is not necessarily collegiality at work where it is most needed.

Collegiality was put to the test when the insurrection began, for now the familiar academic ruts and rails along which summer workshops run had to be recharted and redesigned. It seemed to me that, for all the evident brain-power in place, there was not that much inventive dealing with the potential of the situation on the part either of the core faculty or of the guest experts.

I would fault the core faculty more than I would the visiting scholars. The latter were present only for one week at a time, whereas the former were on deck for all three weeks. In the second and third weeks, when a new visiting expert would arrive, he and she would find

themselves in a post-revolutionary situation that placed demands upon them which had not been foreseen in the planning of the Institute. One or two of the one-weekers complained that the resident staff were not as quick as needed to help the new-comers to grasp and socialize within the unstable situation. This is, perhaps, because the core faculty themselves felt a bit queasy as the sea rose and fell beneath them, but that is precisely the point at which I might offer critique: I am unaware of anything particularly stunning that any of them did in response to and accommodation of the changing realities, and I can list a number of issues and questions that might well have been addressed, had someone taken the bull by the horns. Perhaps Sharon should have taken a firmer hand in redefining collegiality in the face of revolutionary change, but she was preoccupied with understanding her own changed role. Perhaps the participants, whether in committee or as a democratic whole, should have been more proactive in insisting upon the full democratic participation of the paid experts, but the participants were preoccupied with the headiness of the revolution.

The core faculty and the experts were "required" by the revolution to take part individually in the same kinds of group work that the participants were engaging in; however, the professorial rank did not fill out the daily critique questionnaires that were expected of the participants. Had they done so, and done so conscientiously, a higher level of reflection on the process might have been achieved. I also observed that not all of the professorial class attended the daily debriefings following the formal exercises of the Institute. I attended two of those (there was none on the last day), and both of those occasions proved to be productive for future events. Questions raised on those occasions, and conversations held, entailed outworkings that proved formative on the future course of the Institute. The core faculty and guest scholars ought, in my opinion, to have gathered for at least an hour's conscientious reflection every afternoon, at which time the many practical and theoretical issues could have received thorough and mutually informative airing.

Cynthia McDermott, one of the Foxfire folk and another process person complained that her expertise was too little used. I must agree with Cynthia that, although the agenda as planned, was well-balanced between the content and the process people, the usual weight in favor of content people in a university environment allowed them in their usual smug fashion to discount much of the "touchyfeely" and "female stuff" of the process people. Speaking as a content person myself, I tend to agree that content is more important that process; however, on two counts, at this Institute, process needs to have been upheld as of equal importance:

(a) School teachers, having been "brainwashed" by the Schools of Education to study "method" at the expense of "content," always want "how-to" instruction, and this practical kind of knowledge is understood by them as a self-protective, selfpreserving mechanism for use in the classroom. The teachers needed not only more process but better process, and, indeed, after the revolution, they took their vengeance: On the last day, it was, true to form for school teachers, more about process than content.

(b) Because the Institute was supposed to be a study of how democracy might work in the classroom, what was needed above all was an experiential process of democracy taking over THIS classroom, this Institute. To the extent that this happened, the Institute enjoyed its greatest fulfillment; to the extent that this happened only half-way, the Institute failed to achieve the success that it might have achieved.

The intellectual quality of the project, including scholars' presentations:...For scholars' presentations, consider both the intellectual quality per se and the scholar's ability to pitch the level of his/her talk so as to intersect with the intellectual backgrounds of the participants, while "stretching" them a bit.

'a. An embarrassment of riches

There were probably too many chiefs and too few Indians. With 11 permanent corefaculty members and 3 new visiting scholars each week for a total of 9, and other support peo,'e with

various agendas, and Sharon herself, the Institute appears to me to have been top-heavy. The fault for this must lie in part with the Endowment: The passion for multidisciplinarity and for the integration of fields of discourse, while intellectually commendable, led Sharon to bite off more than her Institute could chew. The Endowment monitor of this laudable undertaking might have drawn on previous experience to recognize that too rich a diet had been planned and might have recommended a scaling down by 1/3 or 1/2 the number of presenters.

The participants felt the burden of too many classes, seminars, lectures, and too long a reading list, and in their revolutionary fervor, they reorganized the schedule under the revolutionary banner of "flex time"--their euphemism for: "We don't want to do this much work." Partly this reaction arose from the timing of the Institute: These participants came to the Institute directly from their own school semesters which had concluded only a week-end before; they did not have even so much as a week of breathing time between the end of their school year and the three-week total immersion of the Institute. Had they been rested and refreshed, the Institute might have been able to maintain a higher and more consistent level of intensity.

To balance my criticism, I also need to acknowledge that school teachers are notorious for their unwillingness to read. Research reveals that elementary school teachers read more than do middle school teachers and middle school teachers read more than do high school teachers, but that all public school teachers tend to be relatively aliterate-perhaps they think that they have to read too much at school as teachers so that they are not eager to read on their own time.

In any event, by careful listening, I could detect that very many of the participants had not read very many of the assigned texts that were on the agenda of the Institute. Few, indeed, cited texts or argued from the basis of this or that authority when presenting ideas. A content person such as I am loves nothing more than to hear a student commence an argument by saying: "In the Federalist Papers #10, Madison argued that...." Whether the student gets it right or wrong is profoundly beside the point; at least Federalist Paper #10 has been read well enough so that the speaker dares to cite it. I did not hear a lot of that going on at the Institute.

This is all the more sad because the reading list was quite a fascinating one. They did, however, read the kiddie lit books, I think. Perhaps it tells us something about the general literacy level of our school teachers! Perhaps it tells us that the reading skills that we teach people in college do not entice them to enjoy reading--readers read too slowly, and therefore they become bored with, and tired by, their reading. Speedreaders would have had no difficulty at all in consuming the reading list of the Institute.

The "intellectual quality" of the project was, perhaps, its most outstandingly successful aspect. The work of the core faculty and the visiting scholars in terms of their presentations, lectures, workshops, explication of texts, informative handouts, literature circles, facilitation in participants' interest groups, and other aspects of their scholarship was of the rich breadth and high quality of a smorgasbord on a Swedish cruise ship. I forego submitting a list of details, naming names and mentioning specific intellectual events, in favor of saying that Sharon and her co-planners had conceived an intellectually challenging agenda, carefully picked the presenters, and the latter delivered well. I attended three or four of these presentations on each of my three days of observation, and I inevitably found myself intrigued, instructed, and engaged by what was said and done. The information was solidly scholarly; the activities were psychologically engaging; the applications for classroom instruction were evident and potent. At the end of my first day's visit, I wrote in my journal: "This is so good, I wish I could be here every day."

I observed a literature group working on the how-to subject of "how to use a workshop for teaching." Sharon Andrews herself was the leader; the group was one of conscientious, hard-working school teachers. Just watching them, I loved them. Of all the many groups I observed, this one, I thought, did the best: They were engaging in "democratic planning"; more voices were heard, more individuals volunteered opinions and information; more individuals actually performed some intellectual trick to the delight and instruction of the group, than in any other group activity I watched. They focused on "facilitating" workshops "democratically," asking how one might do that. Sharon kept prompting them: "Let's all practice being facilitators. Who's got a good facilitator question?" The group wisdom seemed to distill in an express awareness of the dichotomy mentioned elsewhere in this report: Lecturer types (especially if they are good at it) tend to do all

the talking; other people are slow to talk and are kept from talking by the gift for speech that their gabby colleagues enjoy.

b. Intellectuality is not the most important concern of democracy.

Part of the failure of the Institute to achieve democratic education lay precisely in the rare intellectual stimulation of the presenters, especially the content people. Ed Warner, for example, is a practicing humanist, a fascinating lecturer, a universal mind, and an adroit exponent of the intellectual capital of which he has total mastery both in terms of his own understanding and his ability to move the pieces around on the board as a classroom performer. Because Ed is so engaging a teacher, his audience is content to sit and be entertained--and, indeed, one does learn a lot. (I took a lot of notes in the sessions of Ed's that I visited, and I put together things that I had never put together that way before.) Because Ed is such a good teacher, we come face to face with an essential discontinuity between "democratic education" and the plea of the well-prepared content person: "Democratic, shmemoratic! We want content and knowledge and informed interpretation. We don't want touchy-feely, sharing of ignorance--and that's what you get when you let the ill-informed speak up. The purpose of education is to let the knowledgeable instruct the ignorant. Let 'em ask questions, if they want to, but then let them keep quiet and listen to the people who know more than they do."

Ed did not say these things, but other people did say these things--and do say these things--about those small-group, adult-education, sensitivity circles where the agenda is to let "the people" express themselves, find their voices, verbalize their values, and discover through self-expression and interpersonal discourse what is significant to them. I suppose some sort of balance is the best one can hope for--a balance between ignorance seeking knowledge, and wisdom restraining its verbosity, so that those who have and those who want can meet one another on some mutually satisfactory basis.

In adult education, the instructional dogma is "student-centered learning," on the theory that no matter how engaging a speaker Ed Warner may be, proper instruction is instruction that is tailored to the needs, wants, and desires of the learner. This is surely an American education dogma that parallels the American marketing nostrum, "The customer is always right." This democratic notion overlooks, however, the essential elitist aspect of education that is predicated on research and scholarship, intellectual activities that essentially belong only to the gifted and industrious who are relatively few in number. This fact of academic life is the historical cause of the root question which some of the people in Sharon's Institute addressed, but which the Institute qua Institute did not answer.

The Institute as democratic happening, however, may have given the best answer that can be given. When, in the name of democratic education, the Queen was pulled from her throne, flex time became the law of the land, the Town Meeting became the constitutive assembly, and the people found their voice, the students in concert with the teachers, not the teachers alone, began to set the academic agenda. Now, everyone was at the negotiating table, and an agenda could be worked out that was acceptable to all, voted on by all, and subject to be criticized by all. In that approach, the most ignorant green-horn has as much voting power as the most distinguished research scholar--one person, one vote--but in the free and open discussion that precedes the vote, the influence of ideas, knowledge, and information triumphs over all.

In that post-revolutionary situation, the big intellectual cheeses may present their wares for approval, but they may not impose them on the people; if what the big cheeses have to offer is really as good as it is rumored to be, then the people can see that for themselves and vote it onto the agenda; if not, then not. The difference is that the educational process hence goes forward by consent of the governed, bottom-up, not on the oligarchic and autocratic principle of someone else deciding ahead of time, top down, what everyone else should study to learn and know. To this extent, I judge the Institute to have been a triumph of democracy. Whether or not each participant learned as much about Jefferson or Thoreau or the Federalist Papers or Lincoln or Civil Rights as I, as a content person, would like them to have learned, I cannot say. I am convinced, however, that what they undertook willing, voluntarily, and with democratic enthusiasm to learn on their

own, they did truly learn and know. How this will translate into a 3rd or 8th or 12th grade class in Vigo County public schools, remains to be seen.

Connections established by participants between the intellectual content and their own classrooms.

Perhaps as efficient a means of pointing to connections established by the participants themselves between content and classroom is to review their own summary of achievements as celebrated on the final day of the Institute. This took place in three ways: (a) Peter Frederick, a visiting scholar, reflected on a pattern of attitude change that the participants had expressed through the three ("four") weeks of the Institute, and then he summarized ways in which the members of the Institute had concluded that their classrooms would now be different on account of becoming more democratic. (b) The core faculty, at the invitation of the revolutionary participants arrayed themselves across the stage and for an hour underwent a "Quiz the Faculty" wrap-up session. (c) Everyone went to the gym for the final "big circle," and individuals who wished to make a final statement walked to the center of the circle, placed some symbolic article in the growing pile, and offered their valedictory.

a. How will your classroom be different?

Democracy in education means acknowledgment of all kinds of diversity in your students. Teaching means learning. Revolution means new responsibility. Individual uniqueness must be lived out in the presence of universality of truth and social goodness. Principle is modified by practice. Thinking is as important as feeling; feeling is as important as thinking. You've got to listen more than you talk. In the first week, everyone was saying: "I was a democratic teacher before I came here, " but we quickly decided that "democracy is killing us, " and we didn't want to do it anymore. In the second week, everyone was saying: "Maybe I can do this." In the third week, everyone was saying: "With the help of others, I MUST do this. " Now starting the fourth week, everyone is saying: "I'm worried! What happens now?"

b & c. By the last day, "participant" had been broadened to include core-faculty members and guest scholars, for a serious attempt had been made to blur lines of class distinction. Therefore, the following list of outcomes, results, and connections are drawn from comments of members of the Institute regardless of whether they were "faculty" or "participant," for these statements seemed to be met with general agreement. This montage of opinions was expressed on the final day during the "Quiz the Faculty" session and during the "big circle" in the gym.

> *We eventually identified a common mission. The core faculty began to treat the participants as colleagues.*
>
> *Activities that work with middle-school kids will work equally well with college-age students--the child is alive in us all. Public school education is good; that's why the Institute needed to be held in a public school setting.*
>
> *We teachers can begin to trust one another, but trusting school kids is hard--they have not yet been socialized to democratic behavior.*
>
> *The idea of being co-learners--teachers and students together--in collaborative learning is powerful. A wide variety of techniques is possible, but the success of each one depends on "who you are."*
>
> *Engaging in controversy in a democratic setting, where strong likes and dislike, strong opinions, may be expressed, is a strong thing.The people need to find their*

voice; what the issue(s) is (are), is irrelevant--what counts is that awed do "our thing" our own way.

When the reading load is too heavy, cut it down.

We need to have everybody know everybody by name from the very first day.

I can be democratic to a point: Now, I'm willing to let my 7th- graders choose on what basis they will be assessed, but that's where I cut it off: I'll do the assessing, not they.

I'm not ready to go all the way, yet. (This was expressed by the only participant who is a school administrator.)

I thought: "I do that. I do that." I'm more democratic than I thought. I found out that I am a democratic teacher.

In the 1960s, there was magic in the air. The Institute got a bit of the magic back.

Listening! Listening is what counts--not just hearing, but attending to meaning. This is just the beginning; the conversation that we have not yet had is the conversation that we will have when we get back to our own schools:

What happens when you try to let the voices of the people in your school speak and be heard? What happens when you bring democratic values into a school where there have been none before.

It's a long haul. I must see with my heart as well as my head

. I am indebted to Sharon: I have experienced a rebirth of respect and passion for The Profession. You (all) made me feel that I really do belong.

We must find organized ways of continuation: (1) specific ways to use the readings, etc., in our classrooms. (2) Ways to continue to support one another in learning. (3) Ways to articulate a model of democratic education and do it, even without an NEH grant.

To do democracy is to be questioned: We must be prepared to live with the consequences. We agree to "accommodate with resistance." (This phrase had become a motto for some to describe the give-and-take of the democratic process, a synonym forpolitical compromise.)

We're going out to make a difference.

The participants became the teachers of the core faculty. The faculty and experts became part of the process, doing what the participants did, not just sitting and observing when not performing.. For teachers to be learners alongside their students, and for teachers to learn from their students as well as students to learn from their teachers, that is democratic education.

Democratic education is like ice and soap bubbles: difficult to create, but even more difficult to maintain.

I've found that I have been a part of keeping traditions going that now I want very

very hard no longer to perpetuate. (Spoken through tears.)

I've been a dictator--a nice one, I think--but now I'll be a democrat.

Candid assessment of any problems encountered--and how they were dealt with

I have addressed this concern of the Endowment, I believe, throughout my report. I have been as candid as I know how to be, pulling no punches, suppressing no information.

Strengths of the project

I have intentionally attempted to balance my judgments and critiques, negative and positive, through my report. The Institute had enormous strengths and evident weaknesses, and in this brave combination, I deem it to have been well worth the expenditure of Endowment funds.

Comment on any matter that you judge significant

The problem is one, partly, of definition: What is "democratic education," or what might it be?

a. Is it education about democracy? That would be the net effect of most of the "content" events of Sharon's Institute--Ed Warner's and some others' sessions were quite rich in content, and the literature groups read stories that were, by some definition or other, about democracy (or pluralism or some other allegedly democratic concern).

But what if one teaches about democracy and teaches un-democratically. The moral exhortation of every thinking parent comes to mind: "Don't do as I do, do as I say."

b. Is it inculcation of democratic principles? This is the word that the Supreme Court has used more than once in attempting to define the role of tax-supported, public education in the American democracy. As agents of the state, whose salaries are paid out of the kitty of the commonwealth, public school teachers are bound to get the ideals, history, institutions, concerns, limits, and potential of democracy across to school kids. The democracy perpetuates itself through an educated citizenry, one oftenhears, and well-informed voters are better voters.

To the extent that Sharon's Institute was an occasion for knowledgeable experts to fill the minds of public school teachers with the notions of democracy, to that extent the Supreme Court would be pleased, for a lot of information exchanged brains.

c. Is it practice in democratic instructional method, so that, then, the teachers, back home in their several classrooms, could model democratic teaching and learning before their students?

This is the area in which the greatest amount of thought-power was expended. As evidenced in the results of the questionnaire, "Where We Are," (see attached statement of results), many of the teachers were ready to reconsider their instructional method in the light of their changing notions of what democracy is or might be. This is an entirely appropriate topic for these teachers to have contemplated together.

The typical school teacher in the classic classroom is the opposite of a democrat: The teacher, not the students, is in charge; the teacher has been hired, put in place, and is empowered by an oligarchy (school board, principal, et al.) who hold total power in that social and political situation; "the people" (i.e., the students) have little or no political power; there is no voting on which teacher one will take or which class; there is neither referendum nor recall, should the teacher turn out to be an intolerable tyrant; in most classes, the students have no voice in the subjects to be studied, books to be read, or other aspects of the course, and the students are

evaluated in a top-down fashion (usually in terms of standardized, i.e., non-personalized) by the didactic autocrat who, in the classroom, is as infallible as the pope and as all-powerful as the emperor.

Even in classes where the teacher is "nice" and pretends to be democratic, the language betrays the reality: What does the teacher "allow" by way of limited democratic behavior on the part of the students? Almost a preoccupation with this style of "niceness" became a commonplace of the Institute, whether it went under the euphemism of "consensus building" or"the Rudeness Rule" or"allowing student participation" or some others. Not by any definition known to me, however, is either the traditionally autocratic classroom situation or even the "nicest" classroom democratic in a sense faithful to the political vision of the founders of the American democracy.

I am not arguing that a democratic approach to education--whatever that might bewould be better, worse, or the same as a the traditional autocratic approach to instruction, even of "nice" autocrats; I am merely observing and remarking on the usual political structure of the classroom, and that the participants in the Institute sensed the discontinuity between saying that one believes in democracy and then behaving, even "nicely," in a fashion that is typical for most teachers. I therefore acknowledge that the participants in Sharon's Institute rightly and thoughtfully took up a range of questions which, though perhaps "petty" (see below), were nonetheless meaningful and indicative and did at least border on raising one corner of the question of democracy as an instructional method.

d. Is it education by way of democratic methods?

As there was very little debate,disagreement, or even discussion during the Institute of new issues requiringdemocratic solution--a decided limitation in my estimation--the emphasis fell, rather, onmethod. This is to be expected, I suppose, among a bunch of school teachers: The main thing wrong with American teacher education is that it is so much about method and so little about content.This criticism cannot be levied against Sharon's plan for the Institute, at least not interms of historic and ideological content, but it can be righteously made, perhaps,in terms of the "transfer of meaning" (as the phrase goes). There was very little concern at all to address any of several possible issues which our nation now faces that require democratic debate, democratic understanding, and democratic resolution: public health care, abortion or not, the death penalty, the failures of the criminal justice system, the cancerous growth of the corrections industry, the application of democracy to capitalism and commerce, the rapid growth of classism between the haves and the have-nots, the effect of classism to perpetuate racism, freedom of speech and the interned America's responsibility (or not) to "share" democracy and its benefits with the rest of the world both politically and economically, gender issues (e.g. admission of women to all-male military schools, a matter that was decided by the Supreme Court during the time of the Institute), and oldies-but-goodies such as school prayer. Maybe this many more topics could be listed, but if any of these, or others like them, were addressed in a serious, substantial fashion, it did not happen on the three days that I observed the Institute.

No, the problem is that these are school teachers, and school teachers tend not to be original thinkers; they may be inculcators and methodologists, they purvey ideas, but they do not conceive of themselves in the first instance as people who are to make abiding decisions about democratic issues and realities. If this is so, however, were it not a failure of an effort at "democratic education," an example of the blind leading the blind? If the teachers themselves have little or no self-concept as individual democrats-the ultimate court of ideological appeal in the political democracy--then they will not model or teach, inculcate or methodologize in such a way as to instruct their students in how to become the ultimate court of appeal of the political democracy. To use education jargon, they will not teach their students how to do "critical thinking" when it comes to democracy; they will not teach their students how to "transfer meaning" from history or familiar circumstances or ideological formation so as to meet new challenges and answer questions that previously have not been answered.

Instead of grappling with the live issues of the American democracy, these school teachers grappled, instead, in a rather more methodological fashion, with a handful of issues facing the Institute itself--flex time, reading load, structure and organization, venue, air conditioning, and food. In a sense, this is good--these were real issues that needed real solutions. In another sense, this is petty--almost a preoccupation with unworthy issues as a mechanism for avoiding dealing with harder issues.

I believe, however, that underneath this "pettiness" of concerns, the teachers were reflecting on the issues of democracy. Already by the end of the first week, "democracy" had become a "worn-out, abused, whorish word," in the opinion of a perceptive doctoral student (the only participant in the Institute who was not himself a classroom teacher, although he had earlier been a none-too-successful classroom teacher, and an outstanding non-democratic one, if I am any judge of character). Democracy, I concluded, is an experimental, experiential reality which, by its very nature, must be reinvented every time by each new group of people who claim it as their own. When that happens, it will of necessity take on the colorations of the concerns of the people who have reinvented it. As Participant Jerry Ward commented during the final wrap-up in the gym: "Democracy is a sand castle, fragile, admirable; and the fun is in making one yourself."

The color of democracy to which the three-week ISU Institute arrived by the time it concluded its relatively short life-span was rather "religious" in nature, if I be allowed a certain poetic license. At the final "prayer meeting" on the last day--a "big circle" in the gym--I sensed that we might as well have been at Christian summer camp seated in a circle around the fire down by the lake.

One needs to keep in mind the psycho-sociology of the majority of the 35 or so participants in the Institute: Mid-western, mostly Christian, mostly Evangelical Fundamentalist, middle-American, middle-class White people (4 or 5 Blacks, and 1 or 2 others that do not fit the stereotype that I am describing), mostly politically centrist, mostly socially conservative, in a rural quarter of a largely rural and agricultural state which is also a solidly Republican state (one of the few states that voted for Bush against Clinton; the home of Senator Lugar and Vice President Quayle).

In groups where these somewhat timid people would actually speak about themselves, they confessed any number of things that indicate that one should not wait upon them for drastic action: "We don't have causes we're willing to die for." "We're still alienated since Viet Nam." "An issue has to affect me personally before it can be provoked to action." "I can be intimidated." In a small group of three women and one man, the women were soft-spoken, not assertive, slow to become galvanized about intellectual issues. School teachers though they be, many of these people are not intellectuals. About some issue before the group, I asked one notably silent woman: "Are you thinking?" "Not really," she replied.

Personally, I did not care much for the Foxfire ideology as it was applied at the Institute (although I confess fairly solid agreement with its stated ideological principles--see appendix). In the stress on consensus-building, rather than in affirmation of majority rule, I sniffed a kind of front-loaded ideological control and post-Marxist social agenda, rather than a genuine freedom of expression and rampant individualism, which, to me, are quintessential aspects of democracy, American-style.

The Foxfire approach, at least as Cynthia McDermott practiced it, was softly manipulative, "nice," seductive, with an emphasis on feeling instead of on thinking, a kind of political reader-response theory. Cynthia conducted a Town Meeting that I witnessed, during which she read a passage about "learning by doing," and then proceeded to facilitate closure by fostering dialogue, making certain that everyone had a chance to speak, calling for "compassionate listening," resisting "domination" of the group by any one speaker, and monitoring turn-taking. In a similar situation, Cynthia suggested the following protocol of questions through which to interrogate oneself to find out if the process were being democratic: How am I feeling about the ideas being presented? What are my thoughts right now? Am I standing up for myself right here, right now? Am I taking part in democratic consensus building? Am I sharing what I have to share?

Who could oppose any of this? Especially what school teacher, the product of the typical American College of Education, could oppose the wonderfully Deweyesque sounding nostrums

above? I was of two minds. On the one hand, it seemed to me that the democracy of the Foxfire approach was feigned--it was pretense democracy. It is a process of social manipulation under the control of ideological purists and P.C. artists who already "know" what the good and right and politically correct answers are, and now they are going to "facilitate" the group (shepherd the sheep) down the garden path towards a soft landing [How many more metaphors could one mix in a single sentence?] They are going to "build consensus" in a cozy room full of Educationists who, because of their previous brainwashing in their respective Colleges of Education, already basically agree.

This is not the lusty, rowdy, hot-and-heavy struggle of free expression, sharp disagreement, put-it-to-the-vote, majority-rule, checks-and-balances political democracy either of the American founders or of the contemporary arenas of reality out there where real issues over which real people disagree are being sorted out in real life. At least one of the Foxfire folk, Terry O'Connor, agreed with this point: "Some people use democratic teaching methods in authoritarian ways," he rightly complained.

On the other hand, however, after I had meditated on the essentially anti-intellectual, Literate, reactive, soft-bourgeois nature of most of these white-bread Midwestern Protestant school teachers, I realized that the soft-sell of the Foxfire approach may well have been the most efficient way to evoke--as opposed to "provoke"--something at least resembling democratic thinking and acting in them. When another facilitator, one with sharper color, brighter clothes, and a more vivid personality, tried more drastic measures, she ran the scary rabbits away.

One fuzzy participant confided: "Before I came to the Institute, I thought I had a definite, concrete concept of democracy and how I would use it in class. Now I'm confused, hearing what everyone else has to say. Now I have doubts." "That's a good thing!" the soft-selling Foxfire advocate of mealy-mouthed democracy responded quietly. Karen Decker, a "Common Ground" person, further corrected my perception when she commented as follows: "These teachers will be far ahead of their peers in Indiana, if they can internalize what they have learned and effect social change in their classrooms and schools

I had to conclude that "some democracy" is better than "no democracy," even if the "some democracy" is of the Foxfire manipulative variety. I also had to acknowledge that most of the teacher-participants really are not democrats of the classroom, even if they think they are, so that exposure to this much democratic thinking and practice over a three-week period was a thorough challenge to their comfortable Indiana political and social sluggishness and to their autocratic pedagogical methods. As one participantteacher commented: "Democratic methods bring out the best and the worst in people".

For people like these, expression of heart-felt conviction tends to come out looking a little bit like religious testimony, and it may be accompanied by tears. Recommitment to being a "democratic teacher" came on the last day of the Institute with a variety of expressions of emotionality, "feminine" (not necessarily "female") bonding, and promises to oneself and others to be even "nicer" in the future than one had been in the past. What any of this has to do with actual democracy, whether conceived of politicallyor educationally, may be quite tenuous, is questionable, but would be worthy of further study, for, clearly, the participants themselves thought that it had something to do with democracy as they define it.

Did the presenters and participants at this NEH Institute discover democratic education? To this question, I have a number of responses:

* I would argue that through the participants' own striving over "petty" issues, they did taste the "power of the people" that can lead to genuine social and political democracy.

* I sense that the presenters who were formed in the classic mold of "university professor"--that class of teacher who receives less teacher-educational formation in his/her profession than does any other teaching professional, and in many places is still accorded the status of god of the classroom--may have witnessed incipient democracy at work and may have willy-nilly become involved, but I believe that their experience will have no influence on their instructional style beyond affording them an interesting tale to tell. Although they were truly pondering the mess of democracy lying all

about them in the Institute, few of them seemed prepared to make hay while that sun shone.

* I judge that the half-democrats who had already pondered some of these issues professionally (I am thinking of the Foxfire folk and some of the "nice"autocrats) gained further food for thought, but I believe that they have already settled for half-definitions of educational democracy that obscure for them the potentially radical nature of consistently democratic teaching and learning.

* I think that some methodological issues that deserved thorough and detailed discussion got short-changed for a variety of reason, and that among these issues are the following:

What would democratic assessment in the classroom be?

How will I, pedagogical autocrat, cope with the fallout of democratic revolution in my classroom, should it ever occur? (Sharon might well have led a round table on this topic, for she had taken the greatest number of direct hits in terms of her being dethroned as queen of the Institute by the insurrectionist democrats, and therefore she was having to process the professional implications and personal feelings attendant upon that event.)

What is the role of the school administrator in the face of democratic education?

How can the concerns of the several stakeholders--students, teachers, administrators, parents, school-board members, tax-payers, the political democracy in which we live--be protected in the event of a revolution fromautocratic to democratic education?

What are the implications of democratic education for the most oligarchic of all educational institutions, the university?

How can the classic concerns of political democracy--one person, one vote; no taxation without representation; referendum and recall; checks and balances, majority rule, among others--be accommodated by similar but different perspectives such as Foxfire-style consensus, niceness, and other half-measures?

How can other concerns--collectivism, feminism, ethnocentrism, multiculturalism, and other post-deconstructionist front-loaded moral and ideological concerns--be accommodated in a context of democratic education without compromising the political and social demands of rigorously democratic process?

What would John Dewey say about all of this if he were alive today?

I take my final comment from a post-it note--my only post-it note--that I received from one of the participants. On the last day, a group had invented a "message board" by plastering one whole wall with butcher paper, and attaching individualized sheets of paper that represented the several members of the Institute--every participant, every presenter, every one--even the hit-and-run evaluator, of whom most people never quite figured out who he was or why he was there (and this is just as well). I did, nevertheless, receive one post-it note message, and therewith I conclude my report and evaluation: "Warren, We finally figured out who you were! Take back the message to NEH...this is important--this NEEDS to be continued!!"

To that pious exhortation, I can only add my own amen.

The following data I gleaned from the "Where We Are" survey I handed to participants on the first day.

Pre-Institute Data

I. What are the characteristics of any democratic endeavor?

a. Political definition

1. participation by the involved in decision-making; vote; share of power (15)
2. freedom of expression of opinion; much discussion; diverse perspectives (6)
3. rule of the people (but who are the "people") (2)
4. fairness (3)
5. dialogue (give & take) (3); negotiation; compromise (3)
6. resolution
7. cooperation; work as a group; compromise; consensus building (11)
8. responsibility, accountability; everyone has a job (4)
9. individual rights
10. absence of dictatorship
11. the freedoms: religion, speech, print
12. equality (equal opportunity) (4)
13. impartiality: what is best for all--not favoritism of one group over another
14. information, ideas; open-ended investigation & conclusions (3)

b. Psychological/Educationist definition

1. expression of feelings
2. those involved help identify goals and procedures
3. relational self-interest (2)
4. empowerment (3)
5. responsibility to be an active listener; listen to many voices (3)
6. ownership (3)
7. having choices (4)
8. rules (?)
9. honesty/trust
10. respect
11. feelings of self-worth
12. be true to oneself
13. re-evaluating
14. risk-taking (2)
15. not stifled by right v. wrong (relativism)
16. relevancy
17. self-reliance

II. Have you ever had a teacher who taught democratically? If so, what were the characteristics of that teacher?

Yes: 20
No: 9
No answer: 1
College profs: 5

Characteristics: Open/open-minded (3), approachable, non-threatening, facilitator, generous, determined, committed, tolerant, good listener, made each student feel important, respect for students and their ideas/voices (9), doesn't pose as "fount of knowledge," well prepared, high expectations, allowed students to take part in decision making (2), allowed discovery, allowed risk-taking, interacts with students, fair/treated all equally, sincere, class rules up for discussion, teacher manipulates democratically (negative meaning of facilitator?), student-centered instruction (2), student-choice in curriculum (6), all-out participation (2), peer instruction, and assessment (3), open to dialogue and diversity (2), cooperative/collaborative/peer learning (2), well prepared, high expectations, willing to change and learn, interacts with students

III. Are you a democratic teacher? What are some democratic aspects of your

teaching?
Yes: 22
No: 1
In-between: 11
No answer: 1

Characteristics: involve all in planning/decision making/curriculum design, voting, choices, voices, class discussion (28); class votes on rules and punishments (2); class discussion of class behavior and self-monitoring; promote diversity of opinion and relativism, dissent within majority rule, diversity, divergent thinking, cooperative problem-solving (2) cooperative learning, open/open-ended, consideration of individual needs, student suggestions for improving the teacher's teaching (evaluation), suggestions for other improvements, welcome students' ideas (2), student discovery, teach students to value and respect each other's rights, listen, accommodate wishes and needs of students

IV. What is the opposite of democratic teaching? Describe.

1.**Titles:** Autocratic/Dictator (9), totalitarian; "sage on the stage"; Hitler; the American public school system; authoritarian (4), brick wall, top-down, boss, rules the room

2. **Characteristics:** Little opportunity (if any) for diverse opinion/ownership, decision-making, input, takes away all choices and forces own agenda (9); do or die!, no accommodation of individual differences; teacher-centered instruction with no input from students; controlling (2); no room for change; arbitrary; highly structured; does not consider students' ideas; memorization and regurgitation (2); teacher is source of what's important to know; teaching a chore (not a shared adventure) when responsibilities are born by the teacher only (2), favors some student over other (unfair, unequal treatment), no regard for students' abilities, does all the talking, all lecture/didactic transmission of knowledge/content-and-book driven/little relevance to students (6), little deliberation on process, little input from students, little innovation, low expectations of students (3), no mutual respect.

A Post-Institute "Where we are Now" document will shed light on the effectiveness of the Institute. Sharon will conduct post-institute interviews and among her questions, she will include the questions above. I leave it to her to make those comparisons and draw useful conclusions.

WARREN LEWIS
Senior Editor, ERIC/EDINFO Press
Chair, Humanities at Martin University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Comment from Sharon: The post-institute surveys were conducted and the data were presented at the annual conference of American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. The paper presented at that conference is appended to this report.

It is difficult to describe the impact that this program had on many people. It was truly a life-changing event for some--especially the high school teachers. I have tried throughout this report to give a sense of the impact in the words of the participants themselves. In speaking recently with one of the high school teachers who participated in the institute, I realized that the impact on her was immense. She said,

> *I never would have organized this reconciliation conference [city-wide church group conference on spirituality, democracy and diversity held November 22, 1997 in Terre Haute--see Appendix P] if I hadn't been a part of the NEH Institute. I realized that everyone is responsible for doing their part in finding common ground among various groups.*

As indeed Warren gave his "amen" to laudatory comments about this institute, I can only give my "amen" to his evaluation. There is little I disagree with--so much is open to interpretation and Warren's informed, lively, heartfelt evalluation expressed the events, issues, problems, and successes of this institute as well as any one could.